

3)
MISCELLANIA
O R
A TREATISE

Contayning *Two Hundred* Controuerſiall
Animaduersionſ, conducing to the ſtu-
dy of Engliſh Controuerſies in Fayth,
and Religion.

Lawrence Anderson
Written by N. N. P.

And dedicated to the yonger ſort of Catholike
Priſts, and other ſtudents in the Engliſh Se-
minaries beyond the Seas. With a Pareneti-
call Concluſion vnto the ſaid Men.



*Predica Verbum: in ſta opportune, importune: argue,
obſeca, increpa, in omni patientia & doctrina
2. Tim. 4.*

Printed Anno M. DC. XL,

1722 12-28-14

To

I

[illegible]

To the yonger sort of Reuerend and
Vertuous Cath. Priestes, and Stu-
dents in the English Seminaries.

REVEREND and Vertuous men,
though I hope, that this ensuing Trea-
tise will become profitable to diuers
of the Catholike Laity; yet ingenuously
I confesse, that it was chiefly and prin-
cipally vnder taken for the advancement of your Stu-
dies in Controversies of Fayth: I meane; not
such of you, who haue spent your last yeares in
humane learning, and points of School-Diuinity,
and are therefore in regard of such your want of ri-
per age, as yet litle conversant in Controversies
of fayth, ventilated at this day betweene the Ca-
tholike and the Protestant. To those others of your
owne function, which are of full, and great yeares,
this Discourse (I confesse) is lesse seruiceable; since
themselues through their owne reading are (no doubt)
well acquainted with most of the Animaduersiones
are set downe; and therefore I would not haue any
such graue and learned men thinke, that I adresse
this Worke vnto them for their further benefite: for I
willingly grant, that though my selfe be of their owne

4 THE EPISTLE
course of life, I shall be ever ready rather to be in-
fructed by them, then undertake to instruct any of
them.

Touching the Subject of this Treatise, it containeth
not certaine Controuersiall Animaduersiones
(for so I here call them) about Matters of Religion.
These Animaduersiones are of most different and
seuerall points, and in regard of such their diversity,
they can hardly be reduced to any certaine Heads, or
can be set downe in any precise Method, with ma-
tuall dependency one on the other. And therefore in
regard of the want of such Method, I haue entituled
the whole Worke Miscellania, as being a mixture
of things in themselves heterogeneous, and of dif-
ferent natures. And although some of them might
(touching the same point) be ranged and set downe to-
gether (and this chiefly in those which do concerne
the Reall Presences) yet I haue purposely, for the
most part, marshalled them in different places, for
better to obserue the order required in the true
Method of Miscellania; that so no one part of the
Booke shall differ in forme from the rest; or seeme
the whole imitating herein the vsuall Order of Ep-
igrams, whose Method in setting them downe con-
sists in not obseruing of Method. There except
certaine Animaduersiones in defence and proofes of
Deity, and of the Immortality of the Soule, which
at the end of the Booke, which I haue thought expe-
dient to amasse together, against such Men, who
make their Infidelity vnder the sculture of Pious
flang.

DEDICATORY

fancy: And wth these Animadversions (being
 promiscuously delivered, without any punctuall order)
 do in part resemble a great plot of ground (not deu-
 ded into any certaine beds, or quarters) wherein con-
 fusedly and scatteringly grow many flowers of dis-
 sent kinds & odours: So here you shall find spar-
 ed Observations of so many points in number, and
 of such different Natures, as that I hold it more con-
 venient to refer the Reader immediately to the pe-
 rusing of them, then to particularize but any few
 heads, in this Dedicatory Epistle.

Let no man muse at this unexpected Method:
 We see, the world in most things is extravagant; the
 Method here used is also (through a kind of ne-
 cessity) extravagant; and thus I am forced at this
 present to humour the World. And I adde hereto, that
 the uncertainty contain'd in this Method, may beget
 for the Reader (as often it doth in Bookes of this na-
 ture and forme) an inquisitive desire to see what
 followeth in each ensuing Animadversion; as pre-
 venting them to be of different Subjects; and so may
 more easely draw on the Reader, to the perusal of the
 whole Treatise.

This Rapsody of Observations (if it be lawfull
 so far to impropriate the word) is taken partly out of
 that most Eminent Cardinall Bellarmine, of
 worthy memory; partly out of the most paynesfull and
 learned worke of the Protestants Apology; and
 of other of the said Authors writings, (out of
 which many choise Observations are now

fully published, which (before, and till now) did by much bidden & concealed in Marginall references, partly also out of all the chiefe Bookes written by the Catholikes, during these last thirty, or forty years, and partly out of the diligent perusal of the chiefe Protestant Writers.

And as we observe, that a man comming into a curious Garden, layeth not hold of every flower, which first presenteth it selfe to his sight, but will gather here and there such, as are most pleasing to the eye, & smell; So I hope, I may here boldly say, I have forborne all vulgar and obvious Observations (and presuming them to be knowne to you already) resting only (and this with the iudgment of other grane men of my Coate, already acquainted with this Worke) in such, as are choysse, selected, and full of matter, which (Vertuous Men) you may vse, as so many short Prolegomena, or briefe instructions, conducing to your future more full, and exact study of Controversies. Here now you have in these few sheets, a full Synopsis, or view of the most weighty Observations; which being made familiar and knowne to you aforehand, may much facilitate and make easy your otherwise more painefull search and study hereafter in those matters, and may furnish you with extemporall and present discourse touching most Controversies: all which severall Observations being (and were) a sermone materia prima of Constructive, or to speake in the Poets Dialogue, rudis, indigestaque moles, would

DEDICATORY.

7

shall be small Labour, saye; and disquisition in any
of you, is collection of the Author's intention.

The Animaduersiones in this Treatise set
downe, are in number, only two hundred. Many
more (I grant) might be added for the increase of
the Number: But these I hold to be most forcing; &
am loath, that this worke through any affected pro-
cury, should become fastidious, or wearisome vari-
ous. And whereas you shall find some acknowledg-
ments of Protestants, to be oftener set downe, then
others, you may conceaue the reason thereof to be, the re-
gard of the severall, or different Illations, or Infe-
rences, drawne from the said acknowledgments, in
seuerall Animaduersiones.

If any of you reape profit by this my Labour (as
I hope diuers of you may, and will) my humble re-
quest is, in recompence of my paynes taken herein,
that you would vouchsafe your remembrance of me in
your prayers, at the chiefest tymes of your Denotions.
I knowe many, of Custome and Vse, in Dedicating
their Bookes to Catholikes, do intreate of them this
kind of fauour; But as for my selfe, my desire and
spirituall need of your good prayers is so vehement
and unaffected, as that I earnestly beseech you, euen
the most precious Passion of our Lord and
Saviour, suffered for the cancelling of our sinnes, by
your owne charitable Disposition towards others, for
to presume those words of the Apostle to be imprinted
in your soules (a): Charitas Dei diffusa est in (a) Rom.
vobis vestris.

A 4

Finally

Finally by what is most sacred and holy, that you would vouchsafe (now and then) your particular remembrance of me (either yet alive, or hereafter dead) in that your most retired and Religious Memento (used in the celebration of the most Blessed and Reverend Sacrifice of the Masse) for the expiating of my manifold sinnes: This I humbly beseech; this in all prostration of saule I implore, and begge at your hands; and in such your performance, ech of you justly may comfort your selues in those words of our Saviour: Beati (b) misericordes, quoniam ipsi misericordiam consequentur. And thus in the good hope thereof I cease, referring you to the perusal of the Treatise it selfe.

(b) Matt.
5.

Yours in our Lord Iesus.

N. N. P.

MIS



MISCELLANIA.

Contayning certaine Controuersiall Animaduersions.

Animaduersion I.

I WILL begin with the approuall, or relating what is, or hath beene accounted the *Scripture*, or the *Written Word of God*, which point concernes the *Bookes of Ecclesiasticks, Tobie, Iudith, Hester, Machabees &c.* Where we are to vnderstand, that the *Canonicall Scriptures* are to vs at this day discerned and made knowne, not by that which either the *Iewes* for a time, or certaine *Fathers* do omit, deny, or doubt of, in their *Canon of Scripture*; but by that, which many *Fathers* do constantly affirme: Since otherwise, and vpon the contrary ground, we might deny with the *Lutherans* the *Epistle of Iames, Iude*, the second of *Pe-* (a) *Off.* *the 2. and 3. of Iohn*, the *Epistle to the end in Hebrews*, and the *Apocalyps*; seeing all these *Epis. bookes* (a) are denied by the *Lutherans*. *Com. 4.* Now the reason of this *Thesis*, or *Proposi-* p. 199
A 5 tion

tion is; because in the Primitive Church the *Canonickall Scriptures* were not generally all at once receaved; but in so great a variety of pretended Scriptures, great care and search was requisite, wherby to determine which Scriptures were Canonickall, & which not: wherby it came to passe, that sundry bookes were for the tyme misdoubted, or by some Fathers or Councells omitted, or not receaved, which yet afterwards were vpon greater search and consideration generally acknowledged. And according hereto D. Bilson Bishop (b) of Winchester thus truly sayth: *The Scriptures were not receaved in all places (at once) no not in Eusebius his tyme.*

(b) In
his survey
of christ
suffering
printed
1604.
pag. 664.

Animaduerſion II.

(c) In his
answ. to
M. R. y.
molds 12.
fut. p. 22
et 23.
D. *Worshippers*, (c) and other of our Aduerſaries do reflect the former bookes of the Old Testament to wit Ecclesiasticus, Tobie &c.) Because they were not first written in Hebrew, and in that they had not for their knowne Authours, those whom God had declared to be his Prophets.

This Argument is weak. For it is a rash assertion, so to measure the Scriptures by the tongue wherein they are written, as to restrayne the Spirit of God to one only language. The vanity of which said assertion is sufficiently disproved by Example of Daniel; a great part whereof (to wit, from pag. 5. vers. 4. *of the ad. script.* cap. 7.) though not

Miscellanea.

it

not written in Hebrew, is yet by our Adversaries acknowledged for Canonically. And touching the second point of this Argument, it cannot be proved, that God would direct by his holy Spirit, no Authors in their Writings, but such as were known, and also further declared by certaine testimonies, to be Prophets. For our Adversaries cannot yet tell, who write the severall bookes of Judges, the third, and fourth of the Kings, the two of Chronicles, the booke of Ruth, and Job, all which bookes nevertheless they admit for true and Canonically Scripture: And hereupon it is, that D. Whitaker (though crossing his former assertion) thus writeth (d): *Multorum librorum sacra auctores ignorantur &c.* The authors of many Script. bookes of Scripture are unknown, as of Iosue, pag. 604 Ruth, Paralipomenon, Hester &c. Thus he. To whose iudgment D. Willet subscribeth, say- ing: *Et* (e) *reccant many bookes in the Old Testam.* ment, the Authors whereof are not perfectly knowne. (f) *Com- tra Du- rationem. l. 2. p. 100. & Kempf. in his Exam. part. 1. p. 94. (g) Diale- (h) Diale-*

Animadversion III.

A Gainst the writings of the Ancient Fathers, the Protestants pretend severall difficultyes. For example D. (f) Whitaker and others, object against the Epistles of Ignatius, that (g) Theodoret, and (h) Ierome do alledge certaine testimonies (from Ignatius his Epistle ad Smirnaenses,) which are not found in that, or any other of Ignatius his Epistles.

(i) By
Aulin
in Psalm.
95. by
Tertull.
lib. adu.
Iudaos
versus fi-
nem. by
Iustin m
Tripbon.
circa mo-
dum.

(k) Eu-
seb. hist. l.
9. c. 29.
Jerom. in
Catal.
prope
ihs.

Epistles. Wherto I answer: First, that the
Auncient (i) Fathers haue in like maner ci-
ted this sentence: *regnabit a ligno Deus*, as the
saying of David in his Psalms; which yet is
at this day wanting in them. And in like
manner some Sentences are alledged from
Tully and Plato; and the same are not to be
found in their writings now extant. There-
fore this former Obiection only argueth,
that certaine parts of Ignatius his Epistles
may be lost; but maketh nothing against
those now remaining. In like sort our Ad-
uersariyes do reiect (as counterfeyte) the
writings of Dionysius Arcopagita, (as con-
fessed to make for our Catholike Doctrine)
their chiefe argument is, in that these his
writings are neuer mentioned by Eusebius
and Ierome. To this may be answered, that
(k) Eusebius & Ierome do confesse, that there
are many bookes and Authors, which ne-
uer came to their knowledge. A thing not
vnlike, if we but remember, as incident to
those precedent tymes, the knowne want
of printing, and great difficulty of *Manus-*
cripts, through the violent persecutions,
which then raigned. Finally touching the
Lytargies of Chrysostome, they vrge (it ma-
king altogether for seuerall poynts of our
Catholike and Roman sayth) that, as M.
Jewell obiekteth (l) Chrysostomes Masse pray-
eth for Pope Nicolas, who was Pope seuerall hun-
dred yeres after Chrysostome: that also it prayeth
for the Emperour Alexius, who liued in like
manner

manner many ages after *Chrysostome*. These are but fridolous Caquils. For in all oulde *Lyurgies*, or Bookes of *Comon prayer*, prayer is specially appointed to be made for *Princes and Bishops*, for the names of whom are certayne places reserved, which are subiect to alteration, according to the change of succeeding tymes and persons. The lyke course wherof, for *Princes* we may discern in the *English Communion Booke*, composed in *K. Edwards* tyme, where according to the change of succeeding gouernment, are inserted the names of *Queene Elizabeth* in some Copes, and of *King James* in other Copes, and yet both of them reigned long after *K. Edward*.

Animaduersion IV.

WE ought not to reject the Authority of ancient & approoued Authors, because there appeare some seeming repugnances in their wrytings. For vpon this ground an vnbelieuing Atheist might bring the Holy Scriptures into question. For example, in *Matth. 27.* words are alledged vnder the name of *Jeremy*, which are not found in *Ieremy*, but in *Zachary c. 11.* In like sort in *Mark* our Saviour is sayd to be crucified in the third hower, whereas in *Iohn 19.* we read that *Pilate* late in iudgement vpo him about the sixt hower. Therefore, whereas our Aduersaries vpon the former ground of incertainty of Mens wrytings, do in like sort

sort seek to impugn *S. Peters* being at Rome,
 because diuers Historiographers do not a-
 gree of the time of his coming to Rome, &
 his stay there; we must content our selves
 in sobriety with acknowledging that recei-
 ued *Axiome* amōg the learned: That is: *Scpe*
constat de re, quando non constat de modo rei.
 Since otherwise we shold not acknowledge
 that *Hester* had any husband, or that at any
 tyme *Iudith* did liue; For the opinions of
 the Iewes are various, both touching the
 persons, and the time herein; & yet we all
 acknowledge that *Hester* had a husband, &
 that there was such a woman as *Iudith*. The
 like vncertainty of the tymes, wherein ac-
 tions were performed (though the thing is
 selfe be most certaine) is made euident e-
 uen from our owne Cronicles: for example,
 touching King *Iohn* his death, whereof see
 the severall opinions in *Holinshead* in his last
 Edition, 3. volume, pag. 194.

Animaduersion V.

IT is worthy consideration to obserue:
 First, how the Protestants in severall
 points make the same Arguments against
 some articles of our Religion, which the
 Iewes were accustomed to make against the
 same. Secondly, how the Protestants som-
 times vse the same answers to our Argu-
 ments, which the Iewes did. For example,
 touching the *Real Presence*, and our recea-
 uing of Christs body in the Sacrament, the
 Pro-

Protestants chiefe Argument is taken from
 the impossibility thereof; to wit, that God
 cannot performe all those points above na-
 ture, which are found therein. And is not
 this obiection borrowed from the *Jewes*, a-
 gainst Christ, giving his body to eat, in
 these wordes: *Quomodo (m) potest hic nobis (m) lobn*
carnem suam dare ad manducandum? Again: 6.
 The Puritans (especially) condemne the
 confession of Sinnes to Man, vpon this
 ground, that *only God can remit sinne*. And do
 they not compare with the *Jewes* herein, de-
 manding: *Quis (n) potest dimittere peccata ni-*
solus Deus? And where it is vulgarly obie- (n) *Mare.*
 cted by the ignorant, that man cannot re-
 member all his sinnes to man; therefore his
 Confession of them is imperfect, and may-
 ned: I say by this reason, we should not
 confesse them to God, since we cannot num-
 ber them to God; no more then to man.
 Now to shew, how our Aduersaries in like
 manner borrow from the *Jewes* their Ans-
 wers to our Catholike Arguments, one in-
 stance in place of many shall serue. We
 Catholikes in prooffe of our Religion de-
 uerge one chiefe Argument, drawne from (o) *offi.*
Miracles, exhibited by God in warrant of *and. cont.*
 the same. All which testimonies taken *10. 11. 12.*
 from the patratiō of infinite Miracles, re- *13. 14. 15.*
 corded by both Ancient and Moderne Au- *16. 17. 18.*
 thours, our Aduersaries do euade, by styling *19. 20. 21.*
 them: *Antichristian (o) wonders*, and (ying *Cont. 1.*
gens, and as wrought by the assistance of the *col. 1486.*
Diuell;

Dimell: how conspiring is this answer with
the Answer of the Iewes, against the Mi-
(p) *Mat.* cles of Christ: *Hic (p) non eijcit Daemonia,*
19. *in Beelzebub Principe Daemoniorum.*

Animaduerfion V I.

A S here aboute we haue shewed, how our
Aduersaries conspire with the Iewes
both in objecting and answering; so I hope
it will not be impertinent to discouer in
lyne ortwo, how that the Protestants do
agree with the Ancient and condemne
Heretiks, in objecting the arguments against
vs, objected long since by the said *Heretiks*,
in impugning our said Catholike
points; as also how our Aduersaries do con-
sociate with the very *Gentills*, or *Heathens*,
against the Catholiks, yea against our beliefe
in *Christ*. For touching the first, we
find, that place to be objected by *Flavio*
the old *Heretike*, against Abstinence and
single life, and so recorded by *Austin*: In
(q) *Au-* single life, and so recorded by *Austin*: In
Hin. l. 10. the later dayes, (r), there shall come some forbi-
c. 4. con- ding to Marry, and to abstaine from certain
tra Paust. Meates. A passage of Scripture, wherein the
Manich. Protestants chiefly insist against single life
(r) 1. Th. and Abstinence. Again (to omit many o-
c. 4. ther such like instances) *Inlinus* (s) *Mar-*
(s) *Iust.* recorderh, that the *Heretikes* of his daye
Dial. cum did (as in respect of the Sacrament) charge
Tripbon; the true Christians, with the grosse and ca-
er *Euse-* nall eating of humane flesh; with which ver-
sch. l. dist. point the Protestants do at this present
s. c. 1.

raid vs Catholikes. Now concerning the
 Heathens; it is cleare, that the Heathens and
 our Aduersaries do mutually agree in deny-
 ing many points, mainained and affirmed
 by the Catholike Roman Church. For
 both the Heathens and the Protestants do
 promiscuously deny *Freevill, Purgatory, In-*
ocation of Saints, vniuersality of Grace, Euan-
gelicall Counsell, Merit of workes, Sacrifice of
the Masse, and many other Catholike and
 affirmatiue articles, taught by the present
 Church of Rome. But to come to the Se-
 cond point, to wit the *deniall of the necessity*
of Christian Religion, do we not find Swin-
 tilius himself thus to getilize with the Hea-
 thens: *Ethnicus* (x) *si piam mentem domi foueat,*
Christianus est, etiamsi Christum ignoret; and
 hereupon Zwinglius particularly auereth,
 that (u) *Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides,*
all Heathens) are now in Heauen: which
 said Blasphemy is in like sort taught by (x)
Gualter, (y) *Bullinger*, and other Protestants.
 Thus farre for this present of the strict as-
 sociation and commerce of the Protestants
 with the *Iewes*, the ancient stigmatized He-
 athens, and the Heathens or Pagans, touching
 matter of Religion.

Animaduersion VII.

The doctrine of the *Reall Presence* to the
 mouth of Fayth, is maintained against
 the Puritans, by Doctor Whitaker, (z) and di-
 vers other learned Protestants; all which

(t) Zuingli-
 in Epist.
 Zuinglij.
 (v) Oeco-
 lamp l. 1.
 pag. 10.
 (u) Zuing-
 gl. tom. 2.
 in expo-
 sit. f. 101

fol. 150.
 (x) Gual-
 ter, in A-
 pol pro
 Zuing.
 (y) Bul-
 linger, 48
 is recor-
 ded by
 Simlerus
 a Prote-
 stant, in
 vita Bul-
 lengeri.

(z) D.
 Whitak.
 contra
 Duranum
 pag. 168.

Bucer in
 Script.
 Augl. p.
 148. &c.

(a) In
his booke
of Ece-
clesiastical po-
licy. pag.
188. D.
Ceuili in
his de-
fence of
Crocker.
p. 77.
(b) M.
Powell in
his con-
siderat.
(c) M.
Forks in
his Epist.
dedic. p. 3.
(d) Inti-
mus, A
Christian
and mo-
dest of-
ficer &c.
p. 11.

men do hold our Catholike Doctrine far more probable, then the doctrine of the others, who only acknowledge a typical presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Again many moderate and learned Protestants (a) do teach the Church of Rome to be the true Church of God, and that men dying in it may be saved: But against the Puritans they thus write: *The Puritans are notorious, and manifest Schismaticke cut of from the Church of God.* And againe: *The Puritans (c) seek to undermine the foundation of fayth.* Now in requitall of this proceeding, the Puritans prefer the Roman Religion, before the Religion of the moderate Protestants; for thus with a ioynt consent diuers of them do affirme in a (d) booke by them written: *If we be in Error, and the Prelats on the contrary syde haue the truth, we protest to all the world, that the Pope and the Church of Rome (and in them God and Christ Iesus) haue great wrong and indignity offered vnto them, in that they are reiected.* Thus they. Now what other deduction from these their seuerall censures can be drawne, then that the Catholike Religion, is the only true Religion, & the Religion both of the Moderate Protestants, and the Puritans is false. For in that each of them prefers his owne Religion before any other, this may be presumed to proceede from partiallity, and prejudice of iudgment in their owne behalfe; But where they hold the Catholike fayth and Church, rather to be

be imbraced, then their Aduersaries sayth and Church, this riseth from a cleare and impartiall iudgment and from the force of all probable credibility. And thus in this busines that most warrantable and receaued sentence taketh place: *Cui cetera partes vel Sella secundas unanimiter deferunt. cum singula sibi principatum vendicent; melior reliquis videtur.*

Animaduersion VIII.

IT is a point of great iudgment to vrge a passage of Scripture by way of illation in that sort in which the illation is of force, & not in any other only seeming inference. I will exemplify my meaning in texts vrged both by Protestants, and vs Catholikes. And first the Protestants do intist in those words of our Sauour, against the reall Presence: *Palpate (e) & videte, quia spiritus car-* (e) Luc.
nem & ossa non habent, sicut me videtis habere; 14.
Handle and see for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to haue. To argue thus: *It is felt and scene, Ergo, it is a body,* is a good consequence, and this is the force of our Sauours words: But it is no good sequele to argue thus *Negatively* (as our Aduersaries from this text do) *It is not felt, nor scene; Ergo, it is no body.* For it may be, that a true body may be present, & yet neither scene, nor felt; because God may hinder, that it shall not transmit any *Species sensibiles* to the sense of sight. Besides, it may be effected

by diuine power, that a body may exist indiuisibly after the manner of a Spirit (as we Catholiks do hould in a sober cōstruction, that the body of Christ doth in the *blessed Eucharist*) and yet we teach, that it is impossible, that a *Spirit* should exist after the manner of a true and naturall body ; or be extended in place. And the reason hereot is this, To wit, because a *Spirit* hath no extension of parts at all, and therefore it is indiuisible. For seeing, to be extended in place, is a *formall effect*, proceeding from its *formall Cause* of extension in it selfe ; if therefore a *Spirit* should be extended in place, we should admit the *formall effect* without the *formall cause*, which cannot be; since the *formall effect* is later in Nature, then the *formall Cause*, and cannot be without the Cause.

To instance in our vrging of some passages of Scripture : In prooffe of temporall punishment after this life, we produce that passage: (f) *Non exies inde, donec reddas ultimū quadrantem*; Thou shalt not goe from thence, till thou repay the last farthing. Fro which words we do not thus immediately inferre (as our Aduersaryes would seeme to haue vs) *donec &c. vntill thou payst the last farthing*; Therefore after thou shalt goe from thence : which inference we grant is not necessary ; seing by so arguing we might endeouour to proue, that Christ should sit at the right hand of his Father, only vntill (and no longer) he make his enemyes his footstoole, according to that

(f) Math.
22. Luc.
12.

that text : (*) *Sede a dextris meis, donec ponam* (*) *Psal.*
inimicos scabellum pedū tuorum; which words 109.

only proue, that at the length the Enemyes of Christ shalbe vnder his feet : So heere we only thus immediatly inferre: *Thou shalt not goe from thence, till thou payest the last farthing; therefore the last farthing may be payed; and consequently, that then thou shalt goe from thence.* This kind of vitious arguing might be instanced in diuers other passages of Scripture, impertinently vrged by our Aduersaries, and falsly obruded vpon Catholikes,

Animaduersion IX.

WHEN we Catholikes complayne of the great Persecutions against the Catholikes only for their Religion in *Q. Elizabeths* raigne; our Aduersaries seeke to choake vs herein by way of recrimination, in auering that as great, or greater was practized in *Queene Maryes* tyme against the Protestants of those dayes. But admit for the tyme so much; yet there is great disparity herein, and there are diuers reasons more warranting the proceedings of *Q. Mary* in that kind, then of *Q. Elizabeth*. Among which reasons these following may seeme to be the chiefe. First, touching *Q. Maryes* tyme, the Lawes, whereby Sectaries were punished for their Religion, were instituted some Eleuen or Twelue hundred yeares since; those tymes not hauing any foreknowledge, that Protestantcy should sway rather in these dayes,

(g) *Con-* then any other erroneous Fayth. In *Q. Eli.*
cil. Lao- *zabeths* tyme the statutes against Catholikes
dicenf. were made at the beginning of her com-
can. 31. ming to the Crowne, which is fresh yet in
Co 31. the memory of many hundreds of Men in
Concil England yet liuing. Those Lawes, wherby
Carthag. *Q. Mary* punished the Protestants, were e-
Can. 16. nacted by Popes, and Generall (g) Coun-
 (b) *AE.* cels (to whose charge and incumbency the
 7. burden of Religion is peculiarly by God
 (i) *Fulke* committed) seconded otherwise by the se-
in his cular authority of Emperours, and particu-
an, v. to larly of *Valentinian* and *Marcian*; of which
a coun- their seconding herein peruse the Councell
terse) of *Calcedon* (h). These other Lawes, were
Cath. p. 35 first inuented by a *Woman*, and a Parliament
 (k) *M.* of *Lay Persons*, the incompetent Iudges of
Napper Faith and Religion. Lastly by the former
thus con- Decrees, a Religion confessed by the chiefe
ffesseth, in Professours of it, to be neuer heard of, at
his Trea- least for fourteene hundred yeares together
zise vpon (and therefore to be an annihilation of faith,
the Reue- which is held by Catholikes to be a de-
lation p. struction of faith necessary to Saluation) is
 68. Bet- interdicted & prohibited. And according
weene hereto *D. Fulke* thus confesseth: (1) *The true*
the yea- *Church decayed immediatly after the Apostles*
res of *tymes*, By these later Decrees a Religion co-
 three fessed by its greatest Enemyes and particu-
 hundredlarly (k) *M. Napper*) practised vniuersally
 and 116. through-
 the Antichristian & Papisticall reigne began, reigning vni-
 uersally without any debatable contradiction, one thou-
 and two hundred and sixty yeares.

throughout all Christendome, almost the space of the foresaid fourteene hundred years, & by the learned sort of Protestants, granted to be sufficient (1) to Saluation, was punished with losse of goods, imprisonment, and often losse of life. And thus farre in an encaution of the Lawes, by which Sectaryes were punished in *Q. Maryes* dayes, and of the Statutes, by which the Catholikes were persecuted in *Q. Elizabeth* her raigne. Only I ad hereto, that it according to *M^r Nappers* confession, our Catholike Religion did raigne *universally*, from the yeares of Christ, 316. yeares, then it evidently followeth, that it did not first then begin, but was vndoubtedly in being long before it could possibly become so confessedly *universal* which said time (so long before) could not be short of the Apostle times.

Animaduersion X.

Diuers of our Aduersaries being pressed to shew, when any change of the Roman Religion came in, as an innouation, & not being able to instance in any one dogmaticall Poynt so introduced, the more easely to cast dust in the eyes of the ignorant, do (m), answere, that the changes of Fayth in
B. 4 the and by

many others (m) Thus answereth D Whitaker contra Camp. *ra. 7. saying: Pili non subito omnes censeant. And againe. In Ecclesia Romana accidit, quemadmodum magno edificio videmus scire, quod rumpat aliquo loco incipit agere &c. Ita Romana Ecclesia temporum successione &c.*

(1) That the Catholike is sufficient to saluation, is confessed by Cath. & right in his reply to D. Whitgifts defence. p. 82. by D. Feild, of the Church. l. 3. c. 46. by D. Couell in his defence of M. Hooker. b. 77.

the Church of Rome, vnespiedly did come in ; euen as hayres of a Mans head insensibly do grow gray , and as houses and edifices without any obseruation of the tyme, become ruinous and decaying ; & yet certaine it is, that the hayres change their former colour to gray , and that Houses become ruinous . To examine these resemblances , as mere impostures, and desperate Eualions , I first say , that the first decay in building, & the first shew of whitenes in hayre is imperceptible , & not to be discerned ; whereas euey change in faith (though but in one poynt or Article) is most markable , and subiect to obseruation . Secondly , the whitenes of the hayres of the head , and the ruins of a house do not happen , but by degrees , and therefore at the first cannot be discerned ; Whereas euey Opinion in Doctrine is at the first either true or false ; and therefore is for such at the First to be apprehended by the vnderstanding . Thirdly , not any haue the charge or care imposed vpon them , to obserue the changes in these petty Matters , But in the Church of Christ , there are euery appoynted *Pastours* and *Doctours* , whose office is to marke the first begining of any innouation in Doctrine , and accordingly to labour to suppress the same . Lastly these deceytfull resemblances (being truly weighed) do recoyle back with disadvantage to the Protestants ; For although we cannot shew , when the first hayre began to be whyte , or

the first sifter in a house beganne to be a
 sifter; yet any notable degrees of the said
 whynnes in the hayres, or of the sifters in a
 house are easily discerned: And therefore
 the Protestants are obliged euen from the
 nature of these their owne similitudes, to
 tell vs at what time some sensible degrees &
 increase of this supposed change did happē.
 And the manifestation of the degrees is to
 be made by naming the *time*, & the *Persons*,
 when, and by whom, such or such a particu-
 lar point of the Roman Religion was first
 sensibly introduced into the Church of
 Rome; The which not any Protestant hi-
 therto hath bene able to shew.

Animaduersion XI.

It is Euidēt, that in the ancient times
 diuers Innouatours did rise, denying this
 or that Catholike Article; as for examples
 The Doctrine of the *reall presence* was first
 denied by certaiue Heretikes in (n) *Ignati-* (n) *As*
 as his dayes, which *Ignatius* was scholler to *witnes-*
 the Apostles: The denyall of *free will* taught *eth*
 by the *Manichees*, as (o) *Austin* witnesseth, *Throd.*
 and therein condemneth them; The like *Dial.*
 may be said of more then twenty articles of (o) *Au-*
 our Catholike Religion, denied by the an- *Rim l. de*
 cient Heretikes, as elsewhere in this Treatise *Harof.*
 is shewed. Now from hence I demonstrati- *cap. 44.*
 uely conclude, that this deniall of the said
 Catholike points in those ancient times
 doth necessarily imply, that the said Catho-
 like

like points were affirmatiuely believed generally taught, both in, and before the times. And thus through the old Hereticks denying and impugning of our said point of sayth, is necessarily presupposed a preterency of those said affirmatiue doctrines, the *Real presence*, *Free will*, and of the rest, whereof those ancient Hereticks *Senets* are merely *Negatives*: I meane they preadmit a former more ancient beliefe of our said Catholike doctrines. For why should any *Scismatices* in those dayes rise vp to deny (as we see this by writing) any of the said doctrines, if those doctrines had not beene then, and before believed?

(p) So
an/ wea-
reth the
Author
of a

Animaduerſion XII.

Treatise
entituled:
of the
perpetuall
viſibility
and ſuc-
ceſſion
of the
true
Church
in all
ages. p. 4.
30. prin-
ted anno
1614.

S Vch frontleſſe Proteſtants, as will maintaine the *Viſibility* of their Church for all ages, undertaking to giue Exāples of ſeueral Proteſtants in ſuch ages, do commonly vie this ſleight and impoſture; That is they begin to inſtance in *Luther*, and ſo vpwards to *Waldo*, who liued about 400. yeares ſince. And then they arriuing to that time (though all thoſe Examples be meere-ly falſe, and impertinent) ſhift off the inſtancing from that 400. yeares to the Apoſtolicall dayes (which contains about twelue hundred yeares) by ſaying: *We ſhall (p) not neede aſcend any higher then to Waldo, which otherwiſe is eaſy to make playne*: thus leauing a thouſand and one hundred yeares, with-
out

producing any one Example of Protestants,
during all that long period of Ages. Now
where I say, the Protestants imposture is this;
point to begin with *Luther* upward (and not
backward towards *Luther*: thereby the
better to conceale from a vulgar eye the
the small number of those ages or Centuries,
for which they endeauour to proue the
a for imaginary *Visibility* of the Protestant Church:
and if they had begun in instancing with
Waldo, who (as is said) liued but some 400.
(any years since; then every simple man might
haue discerned at the first, that they had
passed ouer eleuen or twelue hundred years
at the least (to wit from the Apostles dayes
to *Waldo*) without pretending so much as
one Example of Protestancy, during all that
large circuite of tyme; and so might haue
justly challenged them, for their pretermitt-
ing of so many Ages. In some sort answera-
bly hereto, *Card. Bellarmine* chargeth *Caluin*
with an accustomed slight in this manner.
When *Caluin* vndertaketh to answer ma-
ny texts of Scripture vrged in prooffe of
some Catholike Article or point; *Caluin*
begins to answer two or three of such
texts, as may seeme in an ignorant eye to be
best capable of some shew of answer; and
for the other passages of Scripture, which
are most conuincing for the point vrged, &
in which we Catholikes chiefly insist, and
wherunto *Caluin* cannot pretend any an-
swer, he passeth them over commonly in
these

these words; *The chiefest passages* } have
 were, as for the other texts of Scripture were
 by the Papists to the same end, they are so im-
 pudently alledged, as that it were but tyme lost
 to answer them, therefore I passe them over as
 not worthy of answer. Here is Serpentine craft
 the Carle calls it.) For Calvin thought it be-
 ter policy not to conceale the chiefe
 by vsrged (for that might argue a guil-
 ties in Calvin) but to take particular notes
 of them, and so by sleighting the force
 of all such passages to make the ignorant
 under believe, that they nothing conduce
 to the Catholike point, for which they
 pretended: *Dolus, an virtus, quis in hoste
 querat?*

Animaduerſion XIII.

THE Protestants do set downe the
*preaching of the Word, and the true Ad-
 ministration of the Sacraments* to be the Marks
 of the Church. The reason of this
 proceeding, is double; First herby to re-
 iect the Catholikes Notes of the Church
 (which meane *Antiquity, Visibilty, Succession, Unity*
 &c.) seeing they are not able to iustifie
 these Notes in their owne Church. Secondly
 because by erecting their owne Notes
 of *preaching the Word, and administering
 the Sacraments*, they reduce to their owne Ce-
 sure only; reiecting all other Authorities
 which is the true Church; For they will
 not acknowledge the Word to be truly preached

the Sacraments rightly administred, on-
 such places, and after such manner; and
 (as they themselves where, or otherwise) as themselves
 (so thinke and determine: And yet by
 their proceeding they are mightily
 wounded; And here I will briefly recur to
 it by D. Whitaker sayth of these Notes. These
 Notes being present, do constitute a Church; (q) Whi-
 but being absent, do subvert it. Now the Prote-
 stants during many Centuries have wanted it a Cap.
 the Notes, therefore during all that time; (r) 3.
 Church hath beene wholly extinct, and
 annihilated. That the Protestant Church
 during many ages hath beene deprived of
 the Notes (I meane, of preaching the word;
 and administring the Sacraments) is evicted
 out of the confessed Inuisibility of the Pro-
 testant Church for many Ages; for thus ac-
 cordingly Sebastianus (s) Francus (a great
 Protestant) writeth: For certaine, through the
 Maner of Antichrist, the externall Church toge-
 ther with the sayth and Sacrament vanished a-
 way presently after the Apostles. With whom
 (saith Calvin, thus acknowledging: Factum
 est, ut per aliquot secula &c. It was brought
 to passe, that the true preaching of the word of
 God did vanish away, for the space of certaine
 Notes.

(r) Ep. de
 abro-
 gand. in
 vniuer-
 sum ch-
 ristia-
 nit. Ec-
 cl. 11.
 4. c. 1.
 1. c. 11.

Animaduersion XIV.

Weak and confused Iudgment may suggest
 or conceaue difficulties; but it is a cleare
 Iudgment, that must resolue them. The rea-
 son

son of the disparity herein is this. To take one thing for another, or to erre in the proper nature & essence of things, is the source of doubts, and questions; but to be able to range and marshall together things of one nature, and to deuide and seuer things asunder, which carry a great likenes one to another (for such resemblance of particulars euer begets mistaking) as also to know what essentially is agreeing to the nature of any thing, and what but accidentally accompanieth the same, is a worke of the learned. This I write, that vnlearned men may learne Humility in beliefe, and not seek to apprehend with their weak iudgements the high Misteries of Christian Religion, especially the Articles of the *B. Trinitie*, the *Incarnation*, and of the *Real presence* of Christs body in the holy *Eucharist*.

Animaduersion XV.

IT sometymes may fall out, that the first Inuentour of a false Opinion may be a Heretike, as mantayning it before it be condemned by the Church; whereas the Professours of it after its condemnation, become Heretikes, according to that sentence of Vincentius (1) *Lyrinensis*: *O admirabile change of things! The Authours of one and the same Opinion are esteemed Catholikes, & their followers Heretikes.* Thus we see, that it is contumacy against the Definitions and Decrees of the Church of Christ, which consummate an Heresy.

(1) *L. de
Heresib.*

Animaduerſion XVI.

We are to call to mind, that the Ceremonies in the celebration of the *Maſſe*, are ſucceſſiue, and at ſeueral times added, and firſt brought in by ſeueral Popes; and accordingly we fynd, that the (u) Ad-
 ſaryes of the Church of Rome, as will-
 ing to diſcouer our Innouations (though
 the ſmalleſt Matters, and but in points of
 difference,) haue moſt dilligently, and
 minutely recorded them in their ſeueral
 bookes, written of this very ſubieſt, with
 all due circumſtances both of the Popes in-
 troducing them, and the tymes, wherein
 they were introduced.

Here now I vrge: if the Enemyes of the
 preſent Church of Rome, were thus dili-
 gent and ſolicitous in noting the begining
 of each Ceremony of the *Maſſe*, all ſuch Ce-
 remonies being meere accidentall to the
Maſſe, and without which it may as truly
 and effectually be celebrated, as with them:
 If they (I ſay) could haue diſcouered any
 Innouation in the maine doctrine of the
Maſſe (as the doctrine of the *Real Preſence*,
 the *Sacrifice of Chriſts Body* there offered vp
 &c.) would they haue beene ſilent therein?
 Or rather would they not haue loaded their
 Bookes with relation of all ſuch Innoua-
 tions, they conſiſting not in ſmall Ceremo-
 nies, but in moſt ſublime and high points
 of Chriſtian Religion?

Ani-

Animadversion XVII.

THE Protestants are so various, or rather contrary in their Positions & writings, as that a man may borrow from their severall Confessions, both the propositions & premises, out of which the Conclusion shall arise, wholly making against their Religion.

(x) D. Humphrey thus wryteth: *Oportet Ecclesiam esse conspicuam, Conclusio est Clarissima: It is an evident Conclusion, that the Church of God ought to be conspicuous, & visible.* And M. Hooker; *God hath, and will*

shall have some visible Church upon the earth. But of the confessed visibility of the Church of God, more tully I will shew hereafter. Now touching the Invisibility of the Protestants Church, we reade M. Napper thus

(y) *God hath with drawne his visible Church from open assemblies to the particular godly men.* And D. Fulke confesseth thus (z): *The Church in the time of Boniface the third (which was anno 607.) was invisible & fled into wilderness, there to remaine a long season.*

Now to reduce all these Confessions into an Argument: Thus then I dispute.

D. Humphrey, M. Hooker, and divers others here omitted, doe generally teach, that the Church of Christ must necessarily ever be visible.

But D. Fulke, M. Napper, and many other Protestants (for breuity here passed over) ingenuously confesse, that the Protestant Church hath for many ages beene wholly Invisible; Therefore

(x) D.
Humphr.
Is just. in
part. 2. c.
3.

(y) V.
per the
Remanet.
in c. 11 &
12.
(u) D.
Fulke. in
his ans.
wer to a
counter.
seye Ca.
ab. p. 16.

are even in the Iudgement of the Protestants
 themselves, the Protestant Church is not the
 Church of Christ. This kind of arguing in
 many other Questions may become fami-
 liar to him, who is conuersant in the Pro-
 testants bookes, or in that Catholike Booke,
 called *The Protestants Apology*; wherein a
 man may see euen thousands of Protestants
 Confessions against themselves. Now to
 this I annex this following; that whereas the
 Scripture teacheth the necessary visibility
 of the true Church of God, as also whereas
 diuers leatned Protestants do truly acknow-
 ledge, that the Protestant Church hath for
 many ages beene wholly inuisible; There-
 fore diuers other learned Protestants throgh
 their inueterate malice to our Catholike
 Religion, and as confessing the predicti-
 ons in Scripture of the euer visibility and
 enlargment of the true Church of God,
 not to haue beene accomplished in the Pro-
 testants Church, haue flatly renounced
 their Christianity, charging (brist our Saviour,
 as a seducer, themselves so becomming
 Jews and Turks. I will exemplify this point
 (to omit some others) in these men fol-
 lowing, all before their Apostacy, most emi-
 nent Protestants. First then *David* (1) *George*
 (once Professour at *Basil*) became a bla-
 phemous Apostata: *Ocbinus*. (2) who with
Martyr; first placed Protestancy in
 England, in like sort denied Christ, and
 taught circumcision, as *Zanchinus* the Pro-
 testant

(1) See
 the bit-
 ry of Da-
 uid

George
 printed
 at An-
 twerp.

1568. pu-
 blished by
 the De-
 uins of
Basil.

(1) Of
Ocbinus
 his apo-
 stacy.
Zanchinus
 with fish
 in his
 booke de
Tribus
Elohim,

(3) Of
Neuse-
rus his
Deniall
of Christ,
Oflander
the Pro-
testant
Witness.
Ibid,
Cent. 18.
part. 2.
pag. 818.
(4) Tou-
ching A-
laman-
nus, see
Beza in
Erist. 65.
pag. 308.
(5) The
Bookes
of La-
lius So-
cinus a-
gainst
the Tri-
nity are
yet ex-
tant.
(6) That
Georgius
Paulus
denied

stant confesseth. (3) *Nenferus* (once Super-
intendent of *Heidelberge*) turned *Turk*, and
was circumcised at *Constantinople*, as *Oflan-
der* the Protestant affirmeth. (4) *Alaman-*
nus (a *Switiglian*, and once deare to *Beza*)
became a Jew, as *Beza* himselve sayth. *La-*
lius Socinus (a scholar in the schoole of *Ge-*
nius) did write whole Bookes against the
B. Trinity. Finaliy, (to omit many other
minent Protestants) *Georgius* (6) *Paulus*
(minister of *Craconia*) denied the *Trinity*
with the *Turks*. Thus of Instances for this
point.

Animaduerſion XVIII.

A Man cannot auoide the force of the
former kind of Dispute, consisting in
the Confessions of the Protestants) by re-
plying, that other learned Protestants do
maintayne the contrary in the same point
to the Protestants, about by me alle-
ged. This answer is most weake; the
reason thereof being, in that there is great
disparity betweene learned Protestants
confessing some points, which do aduantage
the Catholike sayth, and others (though
as learned Protestants) maintaining the
contrary; seeing the first sort of men speak
against themselves and their cause; who be-
ing iudicious and learned men, would ne-
uer do; but as being conuinc'd with the E-
uidency of the truth therein; Whereas the
second kind of men do not admit the con-
fession

sessions of their brethren, but speake only *the Tri-*
 in behalfe of their owne Religion; and so *why with*
 such their denyalls are to be reputed more *the*
 partiall. And this *Animadversion* is to be re- *Turks is*
 membered in many other points, confessed *Witnessed*
 by some Protestants, and denied by other *by Stan-*
 Protestants. Now of what force the Argu- *cerus the*
 ment from the authority, or confession of *Protest.*
 an Aduersary is, appeareth both from the *lib. de*
 testimony of the ancient Fathers, and the *Mediat.*
 Protestants themselves. First then Irenaeus *fol. 18.*
 thus writeth hereof: *It is (a) an vnanswera-*
 ble prooffe, which bringeth attestation from the *(2) L. 46*
Aduersaries themselves: with whom conspi-
reth Nazianzeno, saying: It is (b) is the grea- *c. 14.*
test cunning and wisdom of speech, to bynd the
Aduersary, with his owne words. Now tou-
 ching the Protestants acknowledging the
 same, we find Osiander the Protestant, thus
 to write: *The (c) confession & testimony of an (c) In Ep.*
Aduersary is of greatest authority. And Peter Bucha-
Martyr: Among (d) other testimonies, that is first.
of the greatest weight, which is given by the Enc- *(d) Loc.*
cles; Finally D. Whitaker; The (e) Argument *tit. 6. lu-*
most needs be strong and efficacions, which is *deis fol.*
gotten from the Confession of the Aduersaries; *100.*
And I do freely acknowledg, that truth is selfe *(e) Con-*
able to extort testimonies even from its enemies. *tra Bel-*
 Thus much hereof; Therefore I here only *lar. 1. de*
 conclude, that as a testimony of a friend a- *Eclesi.*
 gainst a friend, so of an Aduersary in behalfe *contro.*
 of an Aduersary is of great force, and most *2. q. 3.*
 convincing. So certaine are those words of

(F) In Tertullian: (E) *Magis fides prodest in adversariis semetipsum confidentes, quam pro semetipsum negantes.*

Animadversion XIX.

THere is great difference to be made between Protestants speaking against themselves (and yet believing the Protestant doctrine, and Conclusion) touching some circumstances whereof the Confessions are & between some others, who afore were Catholics, and after do defend some one or other point of Protestancy: Since these later men do not speake against themselves but in defence of some such Protestant doctrine, then newly entertained by them and consequently in defence of their own opinions: And therefore such their authorities are not to ballance equally with the Confessions of the former Protestants. This *Animadversion* is given, with reference to *Erasmus, Cassander, Cornelius Agrippa, Pollard, Virgill, Nilus*, and some others, every one of which imbraced some one Protestant Tenet or other; though diuers of them afterwards recôciled themselves before their death to the Catholike Church, by abandoning their former received Innouations.

Animadversion XX.

Choose rather to dispute with a Protestant touching matter of *Faith* (in which may be proued the falshood of the Protestant

stant Religion) then touching any Dogmaticall point of sayth or Doctrine, as receauing its prooffe from the Scripture. This I speake not, but that the Scripture maketh most clearly for the Catholiks, & against the Protestants; but because your Aduersary in dispute will euer cauill at your exposition of Scripture, reducing it in the end (against all Antiquity of the Fathers, and tradition of the Church) to the interpretation of his owne priuate and reuealing Spirit. Now, in matter of fact your Aduersary is forced to stand to the Authorities deduced from Ecclesiasticall History, and other humane proofes; And therefore he must either shape a probable (if not a sufficient) answer to them; which he cannot do, they wholly making against him euen by his owne learned Brethrens Confessions, or else he must rest silent. And this is the reason, why the Protestants are so loath to dispute of the Church; Since this Question comprehendeth in it selfe, diuers points of fact: as of its continuall Visibilty, Antiquity, Succession, Ordination, and Mission of Pastors &c. All which Questions receaue their proofes from particular Instances (warranted from History,) by shewing the particular Tymes, Persons, and other circumstances, concerning matter of Fact.

Animaduerſion XXI.

WE Catholikes charge the Protestants with a *vicious Circle* of dispute between the *Scripture*, and the *ſpirit*; and in requitall hereof the Protestants do reciprocally inſiſtulate vs Catholiks within the ſaid vicious circular argumentation, betweene the *Scripture*, and the *Church*. Now let vs ſee, whether of vs ſtand truly chargeable herewith. That the Catholikes are free from this kind of arguing, I thus proue: The Catholikes, touching the *Scripture*, and the *Church*, do euer make their proofes in ſeueral kinds of *Causes*, and by a partiall manner of prooſe; and therby do ſtill proue one thing by another, more knowne to thoſe perſons, to whom it is to be proued. The actuall aſſent and beliefe it ſelfe is wrought, wherby we infallibly belieue the Myſteries reuealed; though we belieue the verity of the *Scriptures* reuelation by the authority of the Church propounding, & the Churches propoſition, for the authority of the *Scriptures* reuealing; wherby the *Scripture* reuealing, doth giue vs testimony of the Church propounding; & againe the Church propounding, of the *Scriptures* reuealing. Neuertheleſſe this reciprocall testimony and prooſe is not any proper vicious circle. Firſt becauſe, it is in *diuerſo genere cauſe*, in diuers kinds of cauſes: for the testimonies of the *Scriptures* reuelation to the infallibility

of the Churches proposition, is *causa formalis*, the *formall cause*, by the which we assent to the Churches proposition; But the Churches proposition is only *Causa conditionalis*, or (as we use to speake) *Conditio sine qua non*; to know the *Scriptures* Reuelation; and so they are reciprocall in a different manner of prooffe; the one (that is *Scripture*) à *Priori*, as including diuine reuelation; the other (that is the *Church*) à *Posteriori*, required only as a condition: The former, as a *formall precedent Cause*; the later, as a subsequent annexed condition. Secondly, this reciprocall prooffe is not *ad omnino idem* (as *Aristotle* requires to a *Circle*) that is, the one is not the totall, and sole cause of knowing the other, for the *Churches* proposition is not knowne only by the *Scriptures* reuelation, and not otherwise; but also by other prooffes, signes, and testimonies (to wit *Miracles*, *Consent*, *Sanctity* &c.) all which conuince, that the Churches authority is necessary and infallible to distinguish the true sense of the *Scripture* from false, and to end Controuerfies about *Scripture*. But now to cast oure eye vpon the Protestants *Circle*, prouing the *Scripture* by the priuate *Spirit*, and the *primat Spirit* from the *Scripture*; it is euident, that they proue the *Scripture* by the *Spirit*, and *Spirit* by the *Scripture*, in one & the same kind of *Cause*, and by one sole & whole manner of prooffe: For demand of a Protestant, how, and by

what meanes he vnderſtādeth the *Scripture*? He answeres, by the *Spirit* (and so knowes the *Scripture* by the *Spirit*.) And aske him, by what meanes, he knowes, he hath the true *Spirit*? he answeres, the *Scripture* assures him selfe therof, since he is one of the Elect. And thus this his prooffe is truly singular and vicious, as being deliuered in *ea- dem genere Cause*, and *omnino ad idem*.

Animaduerſion XXII.

IT is most certaine, that Protestants deny all Authorities of all *affirmative* heads, making their last refuge to their owne *private Spirit* and Iudgement. For example, if we insist in the *affirmative Notes* and *Marks* of the Church, to wit, *universality*, *visibilty*, *unity* &c. our aduersaryes (as is aboue said) discard the testimonies of all these heads, by erecting for *Notes*, the preaching of the word, and administration of the *Sacraments*; so reducing to their owne iudgment only, when the word is truly preached, and the *Sacraments* rightly administred.

Yfin matters of *fact* we recurre to *Histo-*
ry (I mean: concerning *visibilty*, *Succession*,
vocation &c.) they reiect this authority by saying: *Sufficit (g) nobis* &c. To us it is sufficient, by comparing the Popish opinions with the *Scripture*, to discover the disparity of faith betwene them and vs. And as for *Histographers*, we give them liberty to wryte, what they will. If we produce the testimonies of

(g) Wbi
sak.com.
tra Du-
raum l.
7 p. 478.

par-

particular Fathers of the Primitiue Church, (h) *Luth.* marke how Luther depresseth them: (h) *The de seruo* Fathers of so many ages haue bene plainly blind, *arbis.* & most ignorant in the Scriptures; they haue er- 1551. pag. red all their life time; & whilest they were amen- 414. ded before their death, they were neither Saints, nor pertaining to the Church. If we produce Generall Councils, they answer saying: (i) *As (i) Peter* long as we insist in Generall Councils, so long we *Martyr* shall continue in the Popish Errors. If we passe *l. de vosis.* to Apostolicall Traditions, *Carrwright* in de- *pa. 476.* pressing Traditions maintained by S. *Austin*, thus wryeth: To (k) allow S. *Austins* saying (k) See (touching Traditions) is to bring in popery. *Carr-*

If we alledge diuers passages of Scripture *wright* (as out of *Toby*, *Ecclesiasticus*, the *Macha-* in *whis-* *lers*,) the Protestants with full voyce de- *gifts de-* ny them to be *Canonick*, and style them *since p.* only *Apocriphe*. If we take our authori- *103.* ties out of such books of Scripture, as are acknowledged for Scripture on both sydes; the Protestants deny the Translation of the Scripture to be true & sincere; which point appeareth, both from the Protestants mutual condemning one anothers translation of Scripture, as also from the most bitter censure giuen by our English Puritans, against our English Translation; whereof seuerall books writtē by them are yet extant.

If we Catholikes proceed further in insisting in the Original of both the Testaments; the Protestants deny, that the *Originalis* are at this present true. Thus for ex-

(l) Beza
in An-
notat.
inqui Te
stim 1556.
(m) Beza
vbi supra
(n) So
doth D.
Whit. l.
de Beas.
Bellar.
Contro.
s. q. 4.
pag. 223.
Iewel in
his A-
polog.
of the
Church
of En-
gland.
act. 4.
cap. 4.
(o) So
the Con-
servists
call them.
Cent. 4.
col. 1445.
or Of-
ficer
Cent. 10.
12. 13.

ample in *Math.* c. 10. we read *ἐγώ εἰμι Πέτρος* the first Peter; Beza (l) denyeth the Original herein, mantayning, that the word *ἐγώ* was inserted into the text by some one fauoring the Popes Primacy: In like sort (m) Beza denyeth that the Greeke Originall in *Math.* 22. is at this present the same, as it was penned by the Euangelist; mantayning that it is corrupted in fauour of the *Real presence*. If we yet ascending further, en- trench our selfe in such books of Scripture, whose *Originals & Translations* are accepted on each party, as true and incorrupted, and tel our Aduersaryes, that the whole Church of God in her primitiue and purest tymes interpreted the passages of Scripture in that sense, in which they are at this present by the Catholikes alledged; the Protestants (n) absolutely deny that infallible Authority of the Church of God in interpreting the holy Scripture; and disclayming from it, appeale to their owne *Primat Spirit* for the true interpretation of the same. Finally, in the last place, if the Catholiks confirme their Religion with the Authority of *Miracles*; the Protestants in answer thereto absolutely reiect the force of Miracles, tearming them (o) but Antichristian wonders, and lying signes, as aboue is shewed. Thus we see, how our Aduersaryes disclayming from all heads of proofes, do finally reduce all to their owne private Iudgment or Spirit. And is not this (I demand) the foresaid vicious

ions Circulation, from the first to the last
 answer, which above is disallowed in the
 protestants impugning, or disputing.

Animadversion XXIII.

Let the words of *Christ* at his last Supper
 are to be taken literally and not *Figurati-*
 ly, is proved by these Reasons followings
 that *Christ* saying, *this is my Body*; (p) *This (p) My*
my blood, did adioyne thereto: *Quod pro nobis datur, qui pro nobis effundetur*; which 14. *Cor.*
 latter words are conformable to the literall
 acceptance of the former words. The same
 verity is proved from the severall circum-
 stances of the fore said place of the Scripture.
 The first circumstance may be taken from
 the matter or *Object*. Here the matter, or sub-
 st of the former words contains the *Insti-*
tution of a Sacrament, the foundation of a
 supreme point of Christian Religion, *A Will*,
 or *Compact*, contracted with the Church.
 But it is most improbable to affirme, that
 a *Sacrament*, a supreme *Article* of belife, or
 a *Compact*, or last *Will* made by *Christ* with
 the Church, should be delivered in figura-
 tive words. The Second Circumstance we
 may take frō the person of *Christ* speaking;
 with whose diuine wisdom and Charity
 it is not agreeable to haue given and mini-
 stred the *Sacrament* by speaking the former
 words of the Institution (in shew, in a lite-
 rall sense, but in meaning, a figurative on-
 ly) an inquitablie occasion of false iudge-
 ments

ment in the Heavens, and of perpetuall Idolatry in the mynds, and wils of the succeeding Christians, during the continuance of the world.

8. Another Circumstance may be taken from the persons of the *Euangelists*, and the *Apostles*, repeating and relating this speech of Christ, *Hoc est corpus meum* &c. All which men, whereas they did write in several times, when some of them were present at the Institution; others receaued relation thereof from them that were present thereat; whereas also they had seene the practise of the Apostles about this Sacrament; whereas lastly they had the *spirit* of true vnderstanding; notwithstanding all this, they did vnanimously conspire in deliuering a playne and literall construction of our Sauours words. Which reason is more preuayling, by obseruing the contrary course which they tooke in explicating other obscure sentences of our Sauour; for those words, *Soluite templum hoc, & in tribus diebus reedificabo illud*, the Euangelist did interpret of Christs Body saying: ille (q) *seu dicebat de templo corporis sui*; to preuent, that the Iewes should not thinke, that our Sauour spake of the Temple of *Salomon*. In like manner the said Euangelist is found to haue expounded other of our Sauours doubtfull sayings, though in themselves of much lesse importance, as Christs (r) *exaltation from the earth*: The sleeping of *Lazarus*.

(q) Iohn
cap. 2.

(r) Cap.
11.

all Id. (a) *girding of Peter, and stretching forth his* (a) Cap.
 fuce *and c.* And yet neuer expounded the 12
 ance *words of the Institution otherwise, then in*
 their plaine, direct, & literall sense:

take Another from the *Persons of the Apostles,*
 and the *hearing Christ instituting the Sacrament:*
 speac Now, if there were any figuratiue speech in
 the words of Christ (especially concerning
 a few so great a matter) the Apostles then pre-
 sent would neuer haue omitted to haue as-
 ked Christ, what had berne the meaning of
 those strange words, being vttered a little
 before his death: As they did touching o-
 ther darke speeches spoken by Christ; and
 thus we read them to haue said: *Ediffere (t) (t) Math.*
mihi parabolam Zizaniorum. And againe: *Edif-*
icate nobis hanc Parabolam. Again from 13. 17. 19.
 the persons of the *Capharnaits*, who did
 take our Sauiours words in that sense, as he
 did properly speake of his flesh to be truly
 and really eaten, and at such their constru-
 ction they rested much scandalized: Neuer-
 thelesse Christ did not therefore explaine his
 formes speech, nor excuse it by any Tropes
 or figuratiue phrase of words; but more
 vehemently affirmed his sentence in the
 same words, and with earnest asseueration
 repeated the same.

Another Circumstance may be taken
 from the *place* of his last supper, which
 Christ did choose to be very secret, admit-
 ting thereto only his Apostles, to whom it
 was giuen to know, and to haue the Intel-
 ligence

ligence of the diuine *Mysteris*: Therefore in this most secret and reserved schoole of the *Apostles*; wherein a supreme mystery of faith was deliuered, he did speake sincerely, simply, plainly, and not by figures.

7. In this last place we may call to mind the circumstances of this busines; as the *Pronouncing of the sacred words of the Institution*; the *Waibling of the Apostles feet*; *Christ's desire of performing this Mystery*; his *casting up his eyes towards Heauen*; his *application of the words to the matter*; his *separated and disioyned blessing of both the Elements*; his *fraction, and giuing, and uniting to a new supper*; his *owne eating, and after commanding the eating of it to others*; and lastly his most holy speech delivered thereof, in Iohn 14. 15. &c. Here now I conclude, that all these reasons with the former observations; are most sufficient to perswade any man of iudgment, that our Saviour did not speake Figuratiuely in so serious a matter.

Animaduersion. XXIV.

The various interpretation of the words of the *Institution* (made by Protestants) doth sufficiently discover their Errour in the doctrine thereof. *Carlostadius* (u) teacheth, that by the Pronounce, *Hoc*, the *Adverb, Hic*, is to be vnderstood; so as the meaning of the words he saith is, *Hic* (that is, in this place) *stet corpus meum*. *Bucer* (x) affirmeth, that by the Pronounce, *Hoc*, is vnderstood

(u) *Carlostadius*
in lib. 6.
de B.
fil. 114.
(x) In
tract.

understood the whole action of the Supper; so
 the sense should be; Hoc &c. This action
 represent the body of Christ. *Swinglins* (y) (y) *Swing-*
 maintayneth, that the figure is not in, Hoc; gl. 1 de
 in the verbe, *Est*, which here ought to be vera &
 taken figuratiuely, for significat. *Boquimus* fallow
 as the teachereth) that the bread is truly called lig. cap.
 the body of Christ, propter communicationem de Eu-
 charistia; as by the same we truly say of Christ.
 This man is God. *Oecolampadius*, (a) (a) *Bo-*
 knowledgeth not any Trope either in the quiver
 pronoun *Hoc*, or in the Verbe *Est*, but in in xam
 thus interpreting the words by the lib tie-
 figure *Metonymia*; *Hoc est corpus meum; id est*, shuf.
 the panis est figura corporis mei. Finally (to (a) L de
 others) *Calvus* (b) admitteth with genuis
Oecolampadius the figure to be in the word explicat.
corpus, but withall he addeth, that the (b) *Calvus*
 bread of the *Eucharist* is not a naked signe l a. Inft.
 of the body of Christ; but it is a signe or fi- e 17. 4.
 gure, which doth truly exhibit the thing it
 self, to wit the body of Christ. Thus we see
 that diuers interpretations (and all false)
 our Aduersaries do giue of the words of
 the Institution: And thus, as they all reiect
 our Catholike interpretation of them; so
 not any one of the former Protestants doth
 wholly Imbrace the exposition of another.

Animaduersion XXV.

Do not admit this Inference as good:
 Some Fathers do interpret this, or that text of
 Scripture figuratiuely: Therefore, the said Fa-
 thers

they do teach, that such Texts are not to be
 pounded literally. This is a meere Sophism
 for seeing diuers texts of Scripture (beside
 the literall) are capable of *allegoricall* sense
 (as all learned men both Catholicks, and
 Protestants do teach) therefore the *figura-
 tive* sense doth not exclude, but rather o-
 ten presuppose, and admit of the *literall*.
 According hereto S. *Austin* passing over
 (e) *John* 6. presumed and granted) the *literall* sense of
 those words: *Qui (c) bibit meum sanguinem*
 &c. *allegorically* expoundeth them in the
 sort: *Bibere sanguinem Christi, est credere in*
Christum: to drinke the blood of Christ, is to be-
 lieue in Christ. In like sort also do not ap-
 proue this kind of disputing (for it is a
 meere *Schiomachia*, or fighting with a shadow:
) The Scriptures speak honourably of
Marriage, (which all we Catholiks do wil-
 lingly acknowledg) therefore *vowed virginity*
is not to be allowed; our Aduersaries here
 laboring to disualue the worth of *Virginity*,
 by the acknowledged dignity of *Marriage* its
 opposit. For the worth of both these may
 stand together, the one not crossing the o-
 ther, and in things, that are good, we must
 acknowledg there are degrees of goodness,
 and accordingly we here say, *Marriage* is
 good, but yet *vowed virginity* is better. In
 like sort, our Aduersaries vie another frau-
 dulent kind of reasoning called *Logomachia*,
 where leauing the sense, childishly con-
 tend with the naked word; for exaple: find;

by they) the word, *Purgatory*, or *Mass*
 the Scripture, if you can: But what
 followeth from hence? for are the words,
Person, Consubstantiality &c. in the
 Scripture? they are not; must we therefore
 the doctrine of them? To proceed;
 other captious arguing of our aduersa-
 is, is taking hold of the very letter, con-
 ary to the approued mind of the Church:
 example: the word, *Presbyter* in Greeke
 nothing but a *Seniour*, therefore in the
 Church of the new Testament, there are no
 so truly called: But *S. Thomas* in 1.
 2. 2. 13. shall salue this Argument,
 saying; *we are to obserue in words, non tam a-*
quum, quam ad quid, not so much from whence
 they are deriued, as to what, by a warranta-
 ble custome they are applied.

Animaduerſion XXVI.

Heperuerſity of our Aduerſaries is ſuch,
 who lighting vpon ſome few ſtraying
 allages in the Fathers writings, where the
Eucharist is called *bread*, they mainely cry
 out, that in the Fathers Iudgment, it is no-
 thing but materiall *bread*; And yet when in
 every leafe, or page of the Fathers works
 upon this matter, they find it termed, *The*
body and blood of Chriſt; all ſuch places (or els
 wrong them) muſt be interpreted *figura-*
ly: Thus they, inſiſting much in thoſe
 phraſes, which are but rare in the Fathers,
 and paſſing over with a cenſuring neglect

D

ſuch

(e) 1. Cor.
10.

such forme of speeches, as most frequently
occur in their Bookes. Now the *Eucha-
rist* may be called *bread* by the Fathers after
consecration (without any preiudice to
our Catholike doctrine) for severall rea-
sons; the Fathers borrowing this kind of
phraze from the Scripture: *Panis* (e) *quem
frangimus* &c. First, because it is an accusto-
med *Dialect* of the Scripture to call a thing
by that name, which afore it was. Thus in
Genes. 3. *Eua* is called the *bone of Adam*, be-
cause she was made thereof; and the *Scr-
ipents of Moyse* (in *Exod. 7.*) are termed
wandes, because the wandes were turned in-
to serpents: so for this very reason the *E-
ucharist* is sometimes termed *bread* by the Fa-
thers. Another reason, why the *Eucharist*
may be called *bread* by the Scriptures (and
consequently by the Fathers) is in regard
of the similitude, which it hath with bread:
I meane in nourishing the soule, as bread
doth nourish the body. A third reason, in
that the Scripture (and in like manner the
Fathers) do often call things as they do ex-
ternally appeare to the Eye; so the Scrip-
ture calls *Angels*, who appeared in humane
shape, *Men*; and the *Brazen serpent*, a *serpent*,
&c. Therefore the *Eucharist* may be termed
bread and *Wyne*, either by the Scripture, or
the Fathers, in that to the eye it seemeth
only *Bread* and *Wyne*.

Animaduerſion XXVII.

If it be not lawfull to pray to Saints, the reason hereof must be, either because they will not beare vs praying to them. But this cannot be, seeing they are now endued with more Charity, then when they here conuerſed vpon earth; and being ſecure of their owne felicity are more ſollicitous of our ſpiritual good and health: Or els, *because the Saints cannot helpe vs.* But neither this: For if they could help vs with their prayers while they were pilgrimes in this world, much more are they now able, being arrived to their owne Country: Or *because they do not know what we pray.* But not this; because from what ground the Angelis do know the conuerſion of ſinners, for which conuerſion they ſo much reioyce (as is ſaid in *Luke 15.*) from the ſame ground the Saints do know our prayers: Or laſtly (which is the moſt ordinary reaſon giuen by our Aduerſaries) *because an Iniury is committed againſt God, if any other be prayed & inuokd vnto, then he.* But not this; for then it were vnlawfull to inuocate and pray to the liuing; and conſequently *S. Paul* ſinned and offended God, when he writ thus to the (f) *Romans*; Brethren I beſeech you, that you would helpe me in your prayers for me to God. Which kind of prayer the Apoſtle uſeth in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, c. 6, in the firſt to the *Theſſalonians*, c. 5. in his *Epistle to the*

Colossians, c. 4. finally in his *Epistle to the Hebrews*, c. 13.

Animaduerſion XXVIII.

TOuching *Communion vnder one kind*, or vnder both; the true ſtate of this Queſtion is not, whether *Chriſt* did inſtitute the *Eucharift* vnder both kinds; or whether himſelfe and the *Apoſtles* at the firſt Inſtitution of it, receaued it vnder both kinds; or whether the *Apoſtles* and the *Father* afterwards at ſundry tymes did miniſter vnto the *Laity* vnder both kinds (for al this is confeſſed for true) but the touch of the Queſtion is, whether *Chriſt our Sauiour* did giue an *absolute command*, vnto his *Apoſtles* and *Succeſſours*, of adminiſtring the ſaid *Sacrament* vnder both kinds (to wit of bread and wyne) ſo as the deliuering of it to the *Laity* vnder one kind only, ſhould be a breach of our *Lords* precept therein. The *Proteſtants* affirme it to be an *absolute tranſgreſſion*. The *Catholiks* deny it, and maintaine that their *Aduerſaries* do ignorantly confound a *Precept* with an *Inſtitution*, between which two there is great difference: For example, *God* did inſtitute and ordayne *Marriage*, but gaue no precept thereof; for if he had, then all men were bound vnder ſinne to marry: therefore thoſe words, *Crefcite (g) & multiplicamini*, though they be deliuered in the *imperative* woode, neuertheſſe they contayne not any *Precept*; neither by the

(g) Gen.
8.

same reason do those other words, *Bibite* (h) (h) *Mat:*
ex hoc omnes. In which sentence the word *Om-* 16.
nes, is to be restrained: (contrary to our Ad-
 versaries vrging of it) only to all the Apo-
 stles, then present; for if it were to be exten-
 ded to all men vniuersally without restraint,
 then should the Sacrament of the Cup be
 giuen to the Iewes, Infidels, and Children;
 all which notwithstanding are exempted
 from it, euen by the confession of the Pro-
 testants.

Animaduerſion XXIX.

T Teaching the true doctrine of Justifica-
 tion, and merit of works; we Catholikes do
 teach: That we are not to ascribe our first
 justification to our works at all (though we
 be wrongfully traduced to do so) for we
 willingly acknowledge those words of the
 Apostle: *It is* (i) *not of the willer, or of the run-* (i) *Rom:*
er; but of God, who sheweth Mercy. Now
 touching Merit of works, we may deliuer
 the Catholike doctrine in these Ensuing
 Propositions. I

That works may merit, it is required, that the
 party, who worketh, be in state of Grace, and out
 of mortall sinne.

That works do merit, a free and liberall pro-
 mise and Covenant of God is necessary, by which
 his promise of reward made vnto good works, God
 in a manner obligeth himselfe to reward good
 works, according to his promise.

That works do merit, they must take their worth and dignity from our Saviour's passion, and from thence receive (as it were) a new tincture, and dye.

We are further to vnderstand, that the passages & texts of Scripture proving *merit of works*, are of three sorts (so plentifully in the Scripture in prooof thereof.) First, from those places, where eternall life is called *Mercies, a wage, or reward*, as in *Math. 5. & 20. &c.* Secondly, from those places wherein a *heavenly reward* is promised to Men, according to the measure and proportion of their works, as in *Luke 6. Rom. 8. Cor. 3. &c.* Thirdly, from those testimonies of Scripture, which expresse the reasons, that *works are the cause*, that eternall life is giuen, as in *Math. 25. Apocalyp. 2. &c.* in all which places the particles, *Enim, quia, ideo*, are vsed, and are *Causalls*, that is, implying and shewing the reason & cause of a thing. Fourthly, from those places, in which a *reward* is promised to good works, even by *force of Justice*, *Hebrews 6. 2. Thess. 1. &c.* Lastly, from those passages, wherein mention is made of the *Dignity of good works*, as in *Luke 10. 2. Thess. 1. Apocal. 3.* And here we are to note, that touching *Evangelical Counsels*; true it is, that we are so obliged to God, that if we consider Gods benefits bestowed vpon vs, we willingly acknowledge, that man cannot do more good, then he ought to do; no not the thousand part thereof.

beought to do; in that man cannot render any thing of equall valew and worth to Gods benefits. Neuerthelesse, if we consider the Law and Command imposed by God vpon vs, then man may be said to do more, then indeed he is obliged by Gods law to do. For although man cannot exceede, or equall Gods benefits with his owne works; yet he is not become guilty hereby, seeing man is not obliged to performe more, then God commandeth.

Animaduersion XXX.

The Catholiks are charged by their Adversaries, that they do expunge out of the Decalogue those words: *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any graven Image &c.* But this is a meare Imposture of the Protestants. For the truth is, these words heere recited, do make but one and the same commandement with those first words, *Thou shalt have no other God before me*; these later being but more full explication of the first words, & consequently may be omitted somtymes in short numbring, or setting downe of the Commandements. This is thus proued: Every Image is not prohibited in the Decalogue, or ten Commandements, but only that, which may be truly called an Idol; that is, an Image, which is taken for God; or which representeth God, to be that thing, which God is not. Now that Images were not absolutely forbidden in the old Law, appeareth

(k) 3.

Reg. c. 6.

(l) Num.

bers c. 31.

areth in that God commanded the Image of the *Cherubims*, (k) *Lyons*, and *Oxen* to be made, as also the *brazen Serpent* (l). From hence then we may conclude, that the making of Images is not absolutely forbidden by God, as a distinct precept from the first, but only so far forth, as Images be taken for God; and consequently that (as above is said) these words forbidding the making of Images do but make one and the same Commandement with the first words, *Thou shalt not have any other Gods before me.*

Animaduerſion XXXI.

WE are to obserue, that a thing may be pictured to three seuerall ends. One way to expresse the perfect similitude of the forme and nature of the thing pictured: And after this manner only corporeall things are paynted, which are endued with lineaments and colours. And if one should attempt to picture or paint God after this manner, he should make the picture, a true *Idol*. The second end of picturing, is to exhibit some history to the eye: as if a man would paynt the expulsion of *Adam* out of paradise, he ought to paynt God in forme of a Man walking, and *Adam*, and *Eue* naked, byding themselves among the trees; and lastly an *Angell* in mans shape holding a sword, and expelling *Adam* with his wife. Now, who should thus draw this History, doth not intend to represent the nature either of God,

for the Angell; but only to exhibit by
 means of the picture; that to the eyes,
 which another by reciting the Scripture,
 doth exhibit to the eares.. And after this
 manner God may be paynted.

The third end to paynt a thing (without
 reference to History) is to explicate the na-
 ture of a thing, not by any immediate and
 proper similitude, but by *Metaphoricall and
 myssicall signification*. After this manner we
 paynt *Angels*, in forme of *young men, winged,
 sayre, naked of feet &c.* so to signify, that
 they excell in strength, are most swiftly mo-
 ved from place to place, are endued with
 splendour of Grace and vertue &c. After
 this manner also *Vertues* are paynted, as
Justice, fortitude &c. And it is not prohibited
 to paynt or picture God after this third ma-
 ner (notwithstanding our Aduersaryes great
 dislike thereof.) For if (m) *Daniel* doth (m) *Dani*
 describe God sitting in a throne, and des-
 cribeth there also his head, his gray hayres,
 his white garments, therby to expresse his
Majesty, power, and his Antiquity from all a-
 ges, his purity, and *brightnes &c.* why may
 not then God be so pictured to the Eye, as
 the Holy Scripture by reciting of it, doth
 expresse him in words to the eare? *a. 7.*

Animaduerſion XXXII.

It is a peculiar sleight of *Caluin* and other
 our more learned Aduersaryes, that when
 they deny a Conclusion or Proposition

of sayth, affirmatiuely mantayned by the Catholiks; after we haue brought authority either out of Scripture, or from force of Reason, prouing the same denyed point: then in answer thereto they grant the conclusion of that point; but then they render a cause or reason, why in such a Case, our Conclusion may be admitted: so they subtilly obtruding a reason of the Conclusion granted in such, or such a case, for a sufficient answer in deniall of the Conclusion. But this is most exorbitant, and in no sort satisfying the Catholiks arguments. For the more cleare explicating of my selfe herein, I will instance this their imposture in an example or two. We affirme, that the Angels, and consequently God (though all incorporeall) may be pictured. The Protestants absolutely deny this Proposition. We in proofe, that the Angels may be pictured, produce our authorities out of the booke of Exodus, c. 25 & out of the book of Kings, c. 6. in which places, we read that Angels were pictured. Caluin (n) answereth hereto saying, that that was done in fauour of the Pedagogy, and more facill instruction of Men in the Old Law; which tyme is now past. Now here I say, this answer is merely impertinent; for the Question is not in this place, why, or to what end things incorporeall might be pictured (let the cause be what it will) but only whether it be lawful to picture things incorporeall, or not, which

(o) L. 9.
Instit.
cap. 12.
25^e.

which conclusion this answer of Calvin
mitteth for true.

In like manner, to proue *Free will*, we vrge
these words; *Si (o) vir ad vitam ingredi seruas (o) Ma-
ndata*: if thou wilt enter into life, keep the
commandments; where we vrge, that promise
Heauen is made vnder condition: & that
God will not command any thing vnder an
impossible condition; and that therefore
we haue *Free will* to keep Gods Commande-
ments. Calvin answereth hereto, that it is
not absurd to maintayne, that God some-
times for some reasons knowne to himself,
promiseth to men things vnder impossible
conditions; to wit, to the wicked he maketh
such promises, thereby to manifest how un-
worthy they are of his diuine goodnes. But
we reply; We demand not why, or to
what end, God doth make his promises ei-
ther to the wicked, or to the pious; but we
only maintaine, that a thing cannot righte-
ly be promised vnder condition; but only
to him, who hath the vse of *Free will*. This
imposition is most familiar with Calvin and
his followers, and therefore I could wish
the serious reader to be obseruant thereof.

Animaduerſion XXXIII.

In my iudgment the Question of *Images* is
a point to be discusſed chiefly by *Philoso-
phy*, as taking its warrant and ground from
thence; so far forth as there be no abuse of
the Images. My reason is this; what thing
soeuer

soeuer man vnderstandeth, the same he vnderstandeth by the help of a *Species* or *Image* thereof, first wrought in the *Phantasy*, according to that *Axiome* in Philosophy. *Quicquid intelligitur, intelligitur per modum Phantasmatis*. And thus we cannot apprehend or worship God, but by the help & mediation of an *Image* of God, which we frame in our *Imagination* and *phantasy*. Again, if a picture be capable of *disgrace* & *injury*, in regard of the person therein represented; then by the same reason a picture may be capable of *honour*, and *reuerence*. (I meane that kind of honour & reuerence, which is due to inanimate things.) Now that a picture is capable of *disgrace*, or *contumely*, is euident: For example, if a subject disloyally affected to his *Prince*, should deface, breake, or otherwise indecently handle the picture of his *Prince*, by stabbing it with his dagger, or otherwise; or if some *Atheist* (denying the Scripture) should betrample vnder his feete (through scorn and malice) the *Bible* it selfe; would not these *Actions* be severely punished? and might not the picture of the *Prince*, and the *Bible* be said to haue suffered disgrace and indignity thereby, with reference to the wrong and indignity committed against the *Prince*, & the sacred *Scriptures*? Then by the same reason may the *Picture* of *Christ*, and the *Saints* be affected with due religious respect aboue other things, in regard of *Christ*,

and his Saints represented in them, of
whom they are pictures.

Animaduerſion XXXIV.

O vindicate our ſelves from the calumny
of our Aduerſaries, touching the wor-
ſhip, which we exhibit to *Saints & Images*,
ſaying they are for their inſtruction to take no
oath, that *Adoration* containeth three dif-
ferent (p) Acts; the firſt is of the *underſtand- (p) S.*
ing, by the which we apprehend the excel- *Thom. is*
lency of any thing: The Act of the *Will*, by *1. ſent.*
the which we are inwardly moued to ma- *diff. 9.*
niſeſt and proteſt our worſhip, by ſome ex-
terior, or interior Act: The third is an
Exterior Act, by the which we moue our
knee, or bow our leg, or ſhew ſome other ex-
ternall ſigne, in manifeſtation of our in-
ward worſhip giuen. Of which three Acts
the ſecond (which is of the *Will*) is moſt
eſſentiall; ſeeing the firſt may be without
adoration, and the third with irriſion and
ſcorn, as the *Jews* worſhipped our Sauour
upon the Croſſe. Here further we are to
note, that that worſhip, which is giuen to
God, is a chiefe and ſupreme proſtration and
inclination of the *Will*, with the apprehen-
ſion of God, as the beginning and laſt end
of all things, and therefore as our chiefe
good; and it is called by *Deuines*, *Latria*,
and cannot be communicated without Ido-
latry to any creature. Worſhip giuen to
Creatures is diſtinguiſhed according to the
diffic.

different degrees of excellencies in the Creatures; and so according to the different degrees of the worth of Creatures, the worship exhibited is severally called, as *Dulia*, *hyperdulia*, *cultus religiosus*, & *cultus civilis*. Lastly it is further to be obserued, that by the exterior Act, it is not easy to distinguish the severall kinds of worship: for almost all exterior Acts of worship (Sacrifice only excepted) are common to every kind of worship. For according hereto we read, that *Abraham* with the same Act of bowing his body to the ground, did adore God, *Genes. 27.* did worship Angels, *Genes. 18.* and did worship Men, *Genes. 22.* In like sort all men do use to kneele to God in their prayers, to their Princes or Kings, and to their own Parents; yet with disparity of honour to each of these. And heere is the source of fountaine of the Protestants mistaking who hearing, that Catholikes do sometimes exhibit part of that externall worship to Creatures, which is given to God, do instantly exclaime forth, that Papists do commit Idolatry to Creatures. Poore men! commiserate their ignorance, who so much mistake the true meaning of Catholike practice herein.

Animaduerſion XXXV.

The severall, & different tymes of the first comming of *Antichrist*, assigned by our Aduersaries, do euidently proue that

Antichrist is not yet come, & consequently that the Pope is not *Antichrist*, as they in the name of their malice do teach. For (q) *Iuni.* (the eminent Protestant) affirms, that *Hildebrand*, who was Pope anno Domini 1074. was the first *Antichrist*. With whom conspireth *D. Downham* (r). *Ballinger* (s) affirmeth, that *Antichrist* came in the yeare: 1063. he therefore tearming that yeare, *The* stall yeare. *D. (f) Fuike*, and *D. (u) Willet* do place his comming in the yeare 607. and make *Boniface the third* to be the first *Antichrist*. *D. Whytaker* thus wryteth of this point, laying: (x) *Gregory the great was the* true and holy Bishop of the Church; & therefore because our *Adversaries* demand of us the time, when he first came in, we designe, and set downe to them the very tyme of his comming. (y) teacheth, that he came in anno 1040 thus writing of *Leo*, who lined in that time: *Leo did clearely breath forth the arrogancy of the Antichristian Sea.* *M. Napper* (z) ascending higher, iustifies *Antichrist* his comming to haue been in the yeare 313. so making *Silvester the Pope*, the first *Antichrist*. *Sebastianus Francus* (a remarkable Protestant) not content therewith thus averreth: (a) For certaine through the works of *Antichrist*, the externall Church together with the Rites and Sacraments, vanished away presently after qu. a. p. (y) *Confess. General. cap. 7. s. 11. 12.* (z) *Vpon the Reuelat. c. 18. s. 12.* (a) *In Epiſt. de obrogand. in vniuer. criminibus Pontificatus.*

(q) *Vpon the reuel. in c. 12.*
(r) *In his Transiſe concerning Antichrist. ca. 110.*

(s) *Vpon the Apoſt. ſerm. 16. p. 108.*
(t) *In his anſw. to a Compoſitione Cath. pa. 30.*

(u) *In his Synopſ. pag. 100.*
(x) *De Eccleſia cont. Beilar. contr. 94.*

(y) *after qu. a. p.*
(z) *Vpon the Reuelat. c. 18. s. 12.*

after the Apostles departure. Now, meet
diametrically, and crosse to all the former
Protestants, teaching that the Pope is Anti-
christ, Melancthon (b), Bucer, and M. Fox (c)
do teach, that the Turke is Antichrist; and ac-
cording hereto Bucer stileth the Turke (d)
ipissimus Antichristus. Thus much touching
the disagreement of our Aduersaries in
this point.

(b) So is
Melan-
cthon al-
luded by
M. Har-
vey in his
Theol.
discourse.
p. 302.

Animaduerſion XXXVI.

(c) A.D. T He planting of the Christian Religion in
Mon. of England by Ioseph of Arimathia, doth af-
ford an vnanswerable demonstration of the
1576. pa. truth of our Catholike and Roman Reli-
gion. Of this point we first fynd, that not
539. only S. Bede, (who did write the History
(d) Bu- thereof.) but M. Cambden also recei-
er in his leth, that the Brittans of Wales, were first con-
lib. Psal. uerted to Christianity by Ioseph of Arima-
quinque. thia, M. Cambden thus speaking thereof: (c.
Psal. 22. tum (c) est Britannos in ipsa Ecclesie infantia
fol. 146. Christianam Religionem imbibisse; he thus fur-
247. ther writing: Hic floruit Monasterium Glaffen-
(e) In bis burienſe &c. Here flourished the Monastery of
Brit. pa. Glaffenbury, which taketh its ancient beginning
40. of Ioseph of Arimathia. Thus M. Cambden,
57. The same verity is acknowledged by D.
(f) In bis Jewell, (f) and D. Fulke (g) Secondly, we
Pageant find, that D. Jewell confesseth thus; the Bri-
of Popes. tans (h) being converted by Ioseph of Arima-
(g) In thia, held that sayth at Austins coming; he
his booke means
against
Hiskins,
Sanders, pag. 362, (h) In bis Pageant of Popes.

meaning that *Austin*, who was sent by Pope
Gregory to plant his religion among vs En-
 glish. In like manner D. *Fulke* thus writeth
 thereof; The Catholike Britains, (i) with whom (l) A-
 Christian Religion had continued in succession gaind
 from the Apostles tymes, would not receane An- the Rbe-
 tin. From which severall Testimonies we mish Te-
 gather, that till *Austins* comming into En- itam, in
 gland, the Religion planted by *Ioseph of A-* 2. Cor. 11.
matias among the Britains, continued
 unchangeable & without alteration. Third-
 ly, we read, that the greatest differences of
 sayth & Religion, which at that tyme were
 found betweene the Britan Bishops & *An-*
ustin, are recorded to be these following:
 For S. *Bede* (k) relateth, how *Austin* and the (k) *Beda*,
 Britan Bishops did meete at a place called in l. 2. ca. 2.
 his tyme, *Augustinsæt*, for conferring of
 their Religions together: the mention of
 which meeting is in like manner auerred by
Helinshead (l), and M. *Fox* (m), who setteth (l) In his
 downe S. *Austins* Answer to the Britan Bi- great
 hops in these words: Si in tribus his obtempe- Chronicle
 are mihi vultis, vt Pascha suo tempore celebre- of the last
 is, vt ministerium Baptizandi iuxta morem Ro- Eution.
 mane & Apostolice Ecclesie compleatis; vt Genti l. 9. c. 20.
 Anglorum vna nobiscum predicetis verbum Do. (m) A&
 mini, cetera, que agitis; & quanimiter cuncta to. Mon.
 trahimus; That is, if you (Britan Bishops) will Printed.
 obey me in these three things; to wit, in celebra- 1578.
 ing Easter day in due tyme; in conferring of *48. 110.
 Baptisme according to the rites of the Roman &
 Apostolical Church; and in helping vs to preach
 to

to the English; all other matters, which you
contrary to our manners, we will tolerate
suffer. Thus far S. Bede. Fourthly and lastly
it is confessed by D. Humfrey, what Religion
Austin brought into England, in these

(n) Hum
fred. in
Isuit.
part. 2.
rat. 5. p.
5. & 617.

words: *In Ecclesiam. (n) vero quid inuenerunt*
Gregorius & Augustinus. Ovis ceremoniarum
&c. intulerunt pallium Episcopale ad sola missa
rum solemnia, Purgatorium &c. Oblationes
salutaris Hostie. & preces pro defunctis &c.
reliquias &c. Transubstantiationem &c. Nova
templorum consecrationes &c. Ex quibus omni-
bus quid aliud quasitum est, quam ut Indulgen-
tia, Monachatus, Papatus, reliquumque Ponti-
ficia Chaos extruatur? Hec Augustinus mag-
nus Monachus, a Gregorio Monacho edocum
importauit Anglis. Thus far D. Humfrey, with
whom conspire herein the (o) Centurists,
and (p) Osiander.

(o) In
the Al-
phabetti-
call table
of the 6.
Century
in the
first Edi-
tion, at
the word,
Gregory
(p) Epis.
hist. Ec-
cles. cent.
6 p. 189.

Now from all these premisses I thus col-
lect; First, that the true Christian Religi-
on was planted in Britany by Joseph of A-
rimathia, who liued in our Sauours tyme.
Secondly, that the same Religion remay-
ned pure and vncorrupted, at Austins con-
uersion, uerting of England. Thirdly, that the dis-
ferences betweene Austin and the Britan
(p) Epis. were but about two or three small poynts,
or Ceremonies. Lastly, that Austin did
teach in England all the supreme poynts,
which the Roman Church at this day teach-
eth. Now, from all this I inferre, that the
Church of Rome in Austins tyme teaching
papistry

pistry (as our Aduersaries stile it) was
 wholly agreeable (the two former points of
 lastly keeping *Easter* day, and Baptizing with the
 rites of Rome, only excepted) with the
 truth and religion, which was planted a-
 mong the Britains by *Joseph of Arimathea* in
 the Apostles dayes. For it is certaine, that
 the Britains had not yealded their full con-
 sent to those supreme points of our Catho-
 like religion, mentioned aboue by *D. Ham-*
mon; *S. Bede* would haue beene most ready
 to record their stiffness and reluctance the-
 rein, seeing he doth not omit to relate their
 coldnes only in the two former points of
 ceremonies: So certaine it is, that *S. Bede*
 had iust reason to conclude this passage
 with these words (q): *Britones quidem consi-* (q) *Bede.*
derunt intellexisse se veram esse viam Iustitie (i. e. c. 2.
nam predicaret Augustinus; and therefore
 not without euidēt cause *D. Fulk* affir-
 meth that (r) *Austin* did obtaine the ayde of the (r) In his
 Britan Bishops, to the Conversion of the Saxons. consum-
 Thus farre of this argument, in vnfoldings tion of
 whereof I haue beene more long, in that it Purgato-
 is an vnswerable and most conuincing De- ry p. 1134
 monstration, in prooffe of the truth of our
 Catholike Religion.

Animaduerſion XXXVII.

Tis a dissolute kind of arguing thus to
 conclude: In such, or such text of Scripture, it
 is certaine that one parcell of the said text is to
 be taken figuratively: Ergo, all that text or sen-

a) Phil.

21

sence is to be taken *figuratively*; For example, we Catholiks; do vrgethose words, in our warrant to bow at the name of Iesus: *ut (s) in nomine Iesu omne genu flectatur, Caelium, Terrestrium, & Infernorum*; That in the name of Iesus every knee bow, of things in Heauen, things in earth, and things vnder the earth. Now, to this our Aduerariyes reply, that seing the Spirits infernall, or vnder the earth (meaning the damned Spirits in Hell) haue no knees, wherewith they can bow, and that the word knee is ascribed to them *figuratively*; therefore this whole sentence is to be taken *figuratively* only, and not *literally*; and consequently that this text proues not, that we ought to bow at the name of Iesus. To this we reply, that so farforth, as any text will beare a literall sense (it not being impugned by any other text more literall, or by any article offaith) so farre it ought to be taken *literally*; and what follows in the same text, which necessarily is to be expounded *figuratively*, the same we are to expound *figuratively*. The weaknes of our Aduersaries former answere, is otherwise discouered, seeing acording to our Aduersaries former answere, we could not alledge that Text in the *Apocalyps*, *These (t) are they who haue washed their robes in the blood of the Lambe*, to proue, that Martyrs and other Saints of God are saued by the blood of Christ; because seing in this Sentence there are two *Metaphores*, to wit, the word *Robes*,

(1) Apoc.

c. 7.

(wher-

whereby are signified the bodies of the Saints) and the word *Lambe*, (meaning thereby Christ,) that therefore it should follow vpon the former ground of answer, that the word, *Bloud*, should also be here Metaphorically taken; not signifying bloud indeed (and so excluding the bloud of Christ from our Saluation,) but some other thing shadowed thereby. Yea which is more, if this kind of answer were solide, we could scarce produce any one Sentence of the Psalmes *literally* to be expounded of Christ or the Church, since that part of Scripture is most luxuriant of *Tropes*, *Schemes*, and other figuratiue speeches: And yet we see, it is most incongruous to maintayne, that any whole Psalme is to be taken *allegorically*, because we find some figures in certaine passages therof. Now to conclude this point, I add this annotation, that it is the iudgment of all chiefe Deuines, that the *Scripture* touching matter of fayth, is neuer to be vnderstood *literally*, except the literall construction do impugne some other receaued article of fayth, or may be explicated *figuratiuely* by some other more expresse and euident passage of Scripture; or lastly, that words be so euident for a figuratiue Sense, as that in no sort they can be capable of a literall construction.

Animaduerſion XXXVIII.

Oftentymes the *Decrees* of the *Pope*, or a *Councell* are fraudulently vrged by the *Proteſtants* for the *ſiſt Inſtitution* of a thing, when indeed the *Decree* or *Councell* only teacheth the *better execution* of ſome *Catholike* point, afore partly neglected (as for example touching *confeſſion*, the *unmarried life* of the *Clergy*, or *keeping ſet tymes of faſting*;) thus our *Aduerſaries* hereby ſuggeſting a more reformed execution of the practice of the *Doctrine*, for the *ſiſt inſtitution* of it. According hereto, we fynd *D. Whitaker* (u) to alledge *Innocentius* the third *Pope* of that name, ſaying: *Innocentius* was the *ſiſt*, the *inſtituted auricular Confeſſion*; whereas *Innocentius* only decreed, that *Confeſſion* ſhould be more ſtrictly obſerued. Now that *Confeſſion* was generally taught & believed before *Innocentius* his tyme, is euident, ſince the *Centurists* do charge *Tertullian* & *Cyprian* (both which liued eleuen or twelue hundredes of yeares, before this *Innocentius* the third) with teaching the doctrine of *auricular Confeſſion*.

Animaduerſion XXXIX.

W^HE our *Aduerſaries* do produce either *Popes Decrees*, or *generall Councells*, for the impugning of ſome *Catholike* point, be careful to obſerue: *Fiſt*, that particular *Councells*, or *Councells Schiſmaticall* (the

(u) *Whitaker* conſt.
Duraum
l. 7. pag.
490.

is, such as are not confirmed by the Popes authority ; be not obruded vpon you, for true generall Councells . For thus they urge the Councell of Constantinople , against Images, consisting indeed of many Prelats; but neither celebrated , or confirmed by the Popes Authority. Secondly note, that the point vrged , doth concerne *Doctrine of faith*, and not *matter of fact*; touching which later point, it is granted, that a Councell may alter its *Decrees*, vpon better & later Information. Thirdly , that the *Canon* produced out of the Councell doth immediatly concerne the *Doctrine it selfe* of some Article of *faith* : then supposed to be brought in) and not the *name* only to be imposed vpon the same doctrine afore believed , as it happened in the Councell of Lateran touching the word , *Transubstantiation* : The doctrine thereof being confessedly believed many ages afore ; for this Councell of Lateran was in the yeare 1060. whereas (as is aboue said) *H. Hamfrey* chargeth *S. Gregory & S. Austin*, (who liued seuerall ages before this Councell) for bringing into England the doctrine of *Transubstantiation* . Yea (*) *Ursinus* the Protestant insinuates *Theophilact & Damascene* (more ancient then the former Fathers) within the same doctrine of *Transubstantiation* .

(*) In the Treatise attributed to *Vissinus*, intitled, *Compendio factio cuiusdam Theologi, de Sacram.*
pag. 111.
& 112.

Animaduerſion XL.

W Hen we produce the ancient *Fathers* gainſt the Proteſtants, their accuſed miſſe is to make an *Oppoſition* between the *Scripture* and the *Fathers*; maintaining that to follow the iudgment of the *Fathers* is to reieſt and abandon *Scripture*; & that themſelues are to be pardoned for preferring the *Scripture* before the *Fathers*. Beſides to this you may anſwere, that ſeeing the *Fathers* do vrge, admit, and reuerence the *Scripture* in as high a degree, as the Proteſtants do; the mayne question and doubt here, is not whether the *Scripture* is to be advanced aboue the Authority of the *Fathers* (which we all Catholikes do fully acknowledge ſhould be) but only, *Whether the Fathers, or the Proteſtants do more truly* pound the *Scripture*?

Animaduerſion XLI.

T He *Fathers* haue many aduantages and priuiledges for interpreting of *Scripture* and for true or perfect fayth, of which the Proteſtants are altogether deprived. Firſt the *Fathers* liued neare to *Chriſt*, ſome conuerſing with his Apoſtles, others in ſucceeding ages; and therefore more eaſy it was for them to know, what expoſition was then deliuered of the *Scriptures*, and what fayth was firſt preached. Add hereto, that the very praſtiſe of their Religion then

ed (the Church then remayning, by the
acknowledgment of our Aduersaries, in her
purity of sayth) serued as a *Comment* to
them of the *Scriptures*.

Secondly, diuers of these *Fathers* euen
from their Mothers breasts, did suck those
tongues, wherein a great part of the *Scip-*
ture was written; And therefore they were
much aduantaged for picking out the true
meaning thereof; whereas our Aduersaries
g the knowledg of the said tongues is gotten on-
ce by Art and Industry, which euer subscri-
Promotes to Nature.

Thirdly, the *Fathers* deliuered their sen-
to lence and interpretation of *Scriptures* many
e Pages before the points of sayth & Doctrines
full for which they were vrged) were euer
brought in question or doubt, and there-
fore what they writ, was free from all par-
tiality of iudgment, they not knowing,
what Innouations were to rise in these our
dayes: Our Protestant Ministers (their
temporall states being wholly interested
therein) must now of necessity shape the
construction of the *Scriptures*, to the main-
tenance of the Religion now introduced.

The *Fathers*, though writing in seuerall
ages, seuerall tongues, vpon seuerall occa-
sions, do notwithstanding vnanimously
conspire together in their writings: for, *non*
est *Dens* *disensionis*, *sed* *pacis*; and if any one
by chance did vary from the rest, he was re-
prehended by them: But the Protestants

are so contrary in their writings, in main-
rayning meere contradictory and opposit
doctrines, as is most wonderfull to obserue;
of which point who seeke further to be
satisfied, let him peruse such bookes, as are
lately written vpon that subiect.

5. The *Fathers* did cut of all lets and impe-
diments, which might hinder either *Demo-
strations* or *study*; Hence it is, that they imbraced
perpetuall Chastity, contemned all riches &
Honours, chastized their bodies with fa-
sting, prayer, and other spirituall disciplines:
How far different our Protestāt Doctours
are from such courses, I leaue to the world
to iudge.

6. The *Fathers* (I meane diuers of them) did
work many true and stupendious (x) Mi-
racles, which gift of exhibiting Miracles,
God bestoweth only vpon them, who are
gracious in his sight, and who truly serue
him; (But no man can serue God truly,
with a false fayth): The Protestant Do-
ctours neuer yet wrought any one Miracle
in confirmation of their Fayth; the euidency
of which point appeareth from the liberall
Confession of the Protestants themselues:
For D. *Falks* thus acknowledgeth; *It is* (y)
*knowne, that Calvin, and the rest, whom the Pa-
pists call Arch-Heretiks, do worke no miracles:*
to whose confession D. *Sutcliffe* subscribeth;
Gentiles, saying; We do (x) *not practise Miracles, nor do*
Euse-

bins l. 7, c. 14. (y) *Against the Rhemish Testam. in Apoc. c.*
31. (B) In his Examen of D. Kellifons Suruay. printed 1606. p. 8.

teach, that the truth of Doctrine is to be confirmed with miracles.

The *Fathers* (I speake of diuers (a) of them) for professing only their Christian sayth and religion, haue endured with invincible courage and immouable resolution (which they could neuer haue done, but only through the particular assistance of the Holy Ghost) most exquisite tormētts, yea Martyrdome it selfe; of whom it may be truly said: *Paradisi clauis sanguis Martyris*. Our Sectarie Doctours (excepting some Mechanicall and ignorant fellows, burn't for their obstinacy in *Queene Maries* tyme) are so far from suffering any pressuures for professing their sayth, as that most of them haue made their Religion, a ladder to clyme vp to worldly preferments; they by it only enioying (as through want of its losing) riches, honours, & other such temporall aduancements.

The *Fathers* of the Primitiue Church, did represent the body of the whole Church of *Christ* in those tymes; For of necessity it must be granted, that all the seuerall members of the Church of God, did helicue, and practise the same Religion, which *Gregory, Theodoret, Austin, Jerome, Chrysostome, Epiphanius, the Gregories, the Cyrills, Basil, Ambrose, Hilary, Optatus, Cyprian, Irenaeus, Ignatius*, and the like, did teach; since in them according to the seuerall ages, wherein they liued, those words of the Apostle

7.
(a) As
Ignatius,
Polycarpus,
Cyprian and
others.

(b) E-
phes. 4.

stle were fulfilled: (b) *Christ hath placed in his Church Pastours, and Doctours &c.* Now all this granted, it doth inevitably follow, that if the *Fathers* of those severall ages did jointly erre in their interpretation of Scripture, and doctrine of fayth and belife resulting from thence; that then the whole visible Church of Christ did damnably erre in fayth, during all those ages: but this mainly crosseth both the command, as also the promises of Christ; the first in those

(c) Math.
23.

words, *Disce Ecclesie* (c); the second in that sentence, *Behold I am with you all dayes, even to the consummation of the world*; for neither wold Christ ever send men to a false Church; nor can he be said, to be ever with his Church, if he suffer it to professe for many ages a false and erroneous fayth; nor vpon such a supposall could the Church be truly stiled, *Columna* (d); *et firmamentum veritatis*.

(d) 1. Ti-
moth. 3.

9.

Lastly, the more learned Protestants do ascribe all Excellency to the Primitive Church, for purity of fayth (and consequently to the Fathers and Pastours of the Church of those tymes;) for thus we find them to write: Kempnitius thus sayth: *We*

(e) Exa.
Concil.
Trid.
part. 2.
pag. 74.

(e) *doubt not, but that the Primitive Church receaved from the Apostles; and Apostolicall men, not only the Text of Scripture, but also the*

(f) In his
defence of
the A-
polog.

(f) *right and native sense thereof.* D. Jewell: *The Primitive Church, which was under the Apostles and Martyrs, hath ever bene accounted the purest of all others, without exception.*

Finally

Finally to contract this point, D. Bancroft
heretofore the Archbishop of Canterbury,
thus writeth touching *Caluin* and *Beza*: For
M. Caluin (g) and *M. Beza*, I do thinke of them, (g) In his
as their writings do deserue; but yet I thinke bet- Survey of
ter of the ancient Fathers. And with this I end the pre-
touching the libration, or ballancing of the tended
Fathers of the primatiue Church, with our discipline.
Protestant Doctours.

Animaduerſion XLII.

There is one sleight vsed by our Aduersa-
ries, which deserues Annotation. It is
this: They are vnwilling openly to breake
with the Fathers, so long as they can preted
any shew of coniunction & agreement with
them. Therefore when they fynd any of our
Catholike points to be mantayned by the
Fathers, they gently tearme them, *Nanos*,
Nenia, and at most, *Errores*, *blemishes*, and
errors. Thus fauorably they depreſſe in the
Fathers our Catholike Doctrines, because
they would ſeeme to continue members of
the ſame Church, whereof the Fathers were:
But now, they ſtile the ſame Opinions and
Doctrines, as they are belieued by vs, no
leſſe then *Hereſyes*, *blaſphemies*, *Idolatry* &c.
thereby to ſhew, that the Members of the
Church of *Rome* are not members of Chriſts
Church. This deceitfull and different ap-
pellation is preciſely kept and practiſed by
the *Centuries*, *Jlyricus*, Doctour *Whytaker*,
and diuers other Proteſtant Wryters:

Ani-

Animaduerſion XLIII.

OvR Aduerſaries deportment towards the Fathers, is moſt full of impoſture and deceyte: And they uſe certaine ſlepps, or gradations therein. For firſt they labour to euade the authority or testimony of a Father, by ſhaping ſome ſeeming anſwere to it, yet ſtill admitting the authority produced. Next, if the testimony objected by vs out of any Father, be for its perſpicuity not capable of any euading anſwere; then they labour to weaken the authority of the ſaid Father, by making him ſeeme to contradict himſelfe in ſome other place of the ſame point, or els to be contradicted therein by other Fathers. After this manner doth *D. Whitaker*, in queſtion of Traditions ſay of (h) *Baſill*: *Baſilius ſecum pugnat*; as alſo chargeth *S. Auſtin* (i), with the like contrariety in iudgement, touching the ſame doctrine of Traditions. But when they are told, that it is moſt improbable, that the Fathers (being ſuch learned men, as they were) ſhould without any acknowledged retraction of their former writings croſſe themſelves in their later writings; our Aduerſaries then vnmaſke themſelves, plainly calling the Fathers, *ſuperſtitious*, *blind*, and *open maintainers of Popiſtry*, which poynt ſhall be made euident by theſe testimonyes of the Proteſtants paſſed vpon them.

And to begin with *Luther*, he thus writeth

(h) *D. Whitaker*
de Sac. Script.
 pag. 670.
 (i) *D. Whitaker*
ubi ſupra
 880.

writeth
 Father
 and
 errored
 man
 Father
 whom
 beſe
 the C
 doctri
 ſed C
 With
 dem
 the l
 ſcurr
 burll
 The v
 of the
 of th
 Aduer

T O
 Bla
 June,
 hould
 bable
 of ſay
 the S
 ted to
 per o
 ſama
 ſelfe,

writeth of the *Fathers* in generall: *The (k)(k) Luth:*
Fathers of so many ages have beene plainly blind, de servo
 and most ignorant in the *Scriptures*; *They have* urburio.
 erred all their life tyme; and unlesse they were a... printed
 mended before their deaths, they were neither anno
Saints, nor pertaining to the Church. *Melan.* 1511. pag.
 Thon ioyneeth hands with *Luther* herein, in 414.
 these words: Presently from the beginning of (1) Me-
 the Church, the ancient *Fathers* obscured the landib. in
 doctrine concerning *Iustification* by sayth, increa- 2 Cor.
 sed Ceremonies, and devised peculiar worships. (ap. 31.
 With both whome (to omit the like con-
 demning speeches of others, passed vpon
 the *Fathers*) conspires *D. Whitaker*, thus
 scurrilously writing: *Ex patrum (m) errori.* (m) Cen-
bus ille Pontificie religionis Cento confutatus est, tra Du-
 The religion of the *Papists* is a patched Cloath rum.
 of the *Fathers* errors sowed together. Thus far 6 p. 4. 10
 of the severall peculiar delueries of our
 Aduersaries against the *Fathers*.

Animaduersion XLIV.

T Ouching the Controuersy, whether the
 Blessed *Virgin* was conceaued in Originall
 sine, such *Catholikes*, as deny the same,
 should the deniall thereof only as a pro-
 bable and pious Opinion, and not as matter
 of sayth; we therefore are to conceaue, that
 the Sinne of the first *Parent* is communica-
 ted to his Sonnes and posterity, three man-
 ner of wayes. First then, the Sonnes of *A-*
dam are said to haue sinned in *Adam* him-
 selfe, in that *Adam* did transgresse the pre-
 cept

cept of God in Paradise: And because the Sonnes of *Adam* were not then in *actu*, but in *potentia* only, therefore that sinne they contracted not in *actu*, but only in *potentia*. And in this sense it may be said, that the *Blessed Virgin* sinned in *Adam*. Secondly, all the Children of *Adam* are said to be conceived in Sinne, as soone as the child begins to exist in the Mothers Wombe, although it be then vnformed and without life; because a Man then beginneth truly to exist, in respect of one of his parts; & that part hath its beginning from a corrupt Nature, and may be said to be truly vitiated by force of its generation: And in this sense also we acknowledge, that the *Blessed Virgin* had her beginning from a corrupt Nature, and that by force of such generation, it was due, that Sinne should be contracted, as soone as her *Rationall soule* was ioyned to her Body. The third, and last manner, whereby men are said to be conceived in Sinne, is, when their Soules are inspired into their bodies; since at that tyme they beginne properly & really to become Men, and to haue their Will naked of *Originall Justice*, and consequently auerted from God, and in it selfe deformed. Now touching this third and last kind, we should it most probable, that the Soule of the *Blessed Virgin* (euen at the first instant of its creation, and infusion into the Body) was so without spot of *Originall Sinne*, as that person of hers actually existing had ne-

the
du,
hey
tia;
A.
the
ued
to
it
use
cf-
ats
may
its
ac-
pe-
by
that
ner
he
are
eir
ce
al-
ill
ly
d.
re
of
nt
)
as
e-
rt

er any Sinne; she herein differing from all others, in that she was freed from Originall Sinne, euen in the very instant of her Animation. Now here it is to be noted, that the texts of Scripture, vrged by the Protestants to proue, that the *Blessed Virgin* was conceiued in Originall Sinne, haue respect & reference only to one, or other of the first two kinds touching the propagation of Originall Sinne in Man; but they haue not any true reference to this last kynd.

Animaduersion XLV.

It is most wonderfull to obserue the great contempt, and little respect our Aduersaries giue to our *Blessed Lady*. Diuers of the speaking of *Caluin & Beza* (two Sodomits euen by the Protestants (n) Confessions) with great obseruancy stile them (*) *M. Caluin*, *M. Beza*. In like manner, speaking of *Luther* (that wicked Monke) they feare not to call him the *Elias* (o), *Conduktor*, & *Chariot of Israhel*. But when they come to name our *Blessed Lady*; who is an intemperate Virgin, the *Queene of Heauen*, an instrument of mans Redemption, the *Mother of God*, and *Sanior of the world*, most of them bluntly and rudely stile her without any addition of Honour) only *Mary*. O contempt, most sacrilegious, and insufferable!

(n) See
Schlus-
selburg
l. 1. fol.
111. & l.

fol. 93.
(*) So
D. Ban-
crift Hi-
lith Cal-
uin and
Beza, in
his Sur-
uey of
the pre-
tended
disci-
pline.
(o) Fox
A. B.
Mon. pa.
416.

Animaduerſion XLVI.

IN the Hymne of our Ladyes office, thus beginning, *Aue Mariſtella* &c. two paſſages much diſtaſt our Aduerſaryes: The firſt is this: *Solue vincula reis, proſer lumen cecis* &c. which acts (ſay they) are peculiar to Chriſt. And againe in the ſame Hymne, they obiect thoſe words: *Monſtra te eſſe Matrem* as implying a mother, and awfull authority ouer Chriſt. In explication of the firſt, we demaend, that our Lady would looſe our Sinnes, and bring light to the blynd, only by her impetration and praying to her bleſſed Sonne, & not otherwyſe, and therfore in moſt of our ſet prayers to her, we adioyne theſe words following; *Per Dominum noſtrum Ieſum Chriſtum*. Touching the ſecond ſentence: We do not wiſh her to impoſe any command or Motherly authority ouer her Some; But we only vnderſtand hereby: *ſhe wth thy ſelfe a Mother, by appeaſing thy ſonne in our behalfe; & thi; by the remembrance of all thy Motherly tender care and loue towards him in his Infancy, & through the whole courſe of his life; that by thee he may receaue our prayers; and therefore it immediatly followeth in the ſame Hymne, ſumat per te preces*. But now if theſe words be ſuch an eye-ſore to the Proteſtants, what will they ſay to thoſe words of S. Paul: *Omnibus (p) omnia factus ſum, vt omnes facerem ſaluos*: I am become to all men all things, that I may ſaue all? Where the Apoſtle in words aſ-

ſumeth

(p) 1.
Cor. 9.

sumeth to himselfe the *Saluation* of others.
 In like manner, in that *Antiphone* in our
Ladies office, beginning: *Salve Regina* &c.
 Our Aduersaries insist in those words: *Et le-*
sum benedictum fructum ventris tui, nobis post
hoc exilium ostende; And shew to vs after this
 our exile, *Iesus* &c. To which I answer; That
 it is lesse to say: To shew the *Sanior* unto
 men, then to say: To *save* men: And yet we
 read the Apostle thus to say: *Et teipsum* (q) (q) s.
saluum facies, & eos qui te audiunt: Thou shalt Tim. 4.
save thy selfe and them, that do heare thee. Mo-
 reouer it is objected out of that *Antiphone*,
 that the *B. Virgin* is stiled, *Spes nostra*, Our
Hope. To this I say, that these words are v-
 sed, because next after our Lord *Iesus Christ*
 (being *God* and *Man*) we chiefly place our
 confidence in the mediation of the *Blessed*
Virgin; Since our *Hope* is not to be placed
 only in the Authours of our Good, but al-
 so in the Intercessours and ministers there-
 of. And according hereto when our Lord
 said to the Iewes: *Is (r) is Moyse*, who accusis (r) Iobn
you, in quo speratis in whom you hope; Our Sa-
 uour did not reprehend the Iewes, in that
 they hoped in *Moyse*, but because they did
 not belieue *Moyse*. Finally our Aduersa-
 ries cannot brooke our *Lady* to be called,
Mater misericordie, because (say they) *God*
 is the Father of Mercy, therefore the *B. Vir-*
gin cannot, nor ought to be called so. But
 this is no good consequence; for we read, (s) Iobn
 that *Christ* is called, *Lux (s) mundi*, and yet
 9.

- (t) *Matb.* Christ sayth of his Apostles: *Vos (t) estis lux mundi.* Thus such titles may be given to God, and men in a different relation, without any dishonour to God.

Animaduerſion XLVII.

THe puritans do most maliciously peruert ſeuerrall texts of Scripture in dishonour of our B. Lady. For example, First they object (as seeming at least to rest doubtfull of the continuance of our B. Ladyes Virginity)

- (u) *Matb.* that Text: *Et non (u) cognoscebat eam, donec peperit filium primogenitum*; which words (say they) seeme to afford a double Argument: The first is taken from the word, *Donec*, inferring from thence, that after the byrth of her Sonne, she should carnally know *Ioseph*. The second from the words following, *Filium primogenitum*; seeing *Primogenitus* properly signifieth that sonne, which is first borne, in reference to those Sonnes or children which are after borne. I answer, first touching the word, *Donec*, which word (as also the word, *vsque*) doth not euer signify an affirmation after the time expressed, if a Negation did goe before; neither alwayes do they signify a Negation, when an affirmation did precede. For example,

- (x) *Psal.* *Sede a (x) dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum: Sit at my right hand, untill I make thy Enemyes, thy footstool.* Now these words do not import, that after, he shall not sit at the right hand

of

of his Father; The like sentences to these, are these following: *Donec* (y) *transseat Caelum & Terra*, *iota unum*, *aut unus apex non preteribit a lege*. And againe, *Ego* (z) *vobiscum* (z) *Math. sum usque ad consummationem mundi*: In all which locutions & sentences of Scripture, that which is doubtfull is expressed; but that which is certaine, is not expressed, or spoken of. Now touching the word, *Primogenitus*; *Epiphanius* a) denieth, that Christ was called *Primogenitus Mariæ*, the first borne of *Mary*: for the Euangelist sayth not, *Primogenitum suum*, but he sayth *Filium suum, primogenitum*, signifying therby, that he was the Sonne of the B. Virgin, but withall, the first begotten Sonne of God: Seing accordingly we thus read: *Ipse* (b) *namque est primogenitus omnis Creaturæ*; He (to wit Christ) was the first borne of all Creatures. *S. Ierome* sayth, that Christ was called, (c) *Primogenitus Mariæ*, not because she brought forth any other Sonne after him; but because before him, she brought forth no other Sonne. For it is the phrase of Scripture, that those who are *Unigeniti*, are called *Primogeniti*; So *S. Paul* calleth Christ, *Primogenitus* (d) *Dei*, for the only-begotten sonne of God. Lastly they vrge that sentence: *Inter* (e) *natos mulierum non surrexit maior Iohanne Baptista*, There hath not risen among the borne of women a greater then *John the Baptist*; intimating hereby, that the Blessed Virgin is inferiour in dignity to *S. Iohn Baptist*. This

is easely answered; First if the words as they ly e, be literally taken (as our Aduersaries pretend) then should *John Baptist* be greater then *Christ*; Secondly, because *S. Iohn Baptist* in those words spoken by *Christ*, is compared only with the Holy men of the old Testament; but *Christ*, and his Mother, as also the Apostles, belong to the new Testament.

Animaduerſion XLVIII.

Diuers Protestants (as aboue is shewed) do hold such bookes to be *Scripture*, which other Protestants reiect as *Apocryphall*; therefore it followeth, that the *Scripture* it selfe cannot shew, at least to vs (which is the point controuerted) which is *Scripture*; which doubt is only to be referred to the Authority of the Church. And therefore *M. Hooker* truly sayth: Of things (f) necessary, the very chiefeſt is to know, what Bookes we are to esteeme Holy; which point is confessed impossible, for the *Scripture* it selfe to teach. And againe: It is (g) not the word of God, which doth, or possibly can assure vs we do well to thinke it is his word. Now if the *Scriptures* be confessedly vnable to afford vs certaine prooffe of themselves; then in all true consequence of Reason, much lesse are they able to direct & exempt vs in case of doubt and question infallibly from Error; & the rather (as *D. Reynolds* truly confesseth) in (h) that it is not so shew, but the sense of the *Scripture*,

(f) *Eccles. Pol.*
l. 1. Sect.
14. p. 86.
(g) *Ibidem*, l. 2.
Sect. 4. p.
101. &
146 and
D. Couall
in defence
of *M.*
Hooker,
art. 4.
pag. 31.
(h) *Con-*
fer. c. 1.
Diuis. 1.
pag. 69.

Scripture, that must decide Controversies. Now from this I infer, that if according to the learned (i) Protestants here cited, it is to be (i) The determined to vs, which is *Scripture*, by the Author judgment of the Church, which confessedly of the hath the assistance of the Holy Ghost in in-Treatise fallibly discerning to vs, which Books of of the *Scripture* are sacred, and which not; then ne- *Scripture* cessarily followeth the Churches no lesse and the Church, needfull assistance of the same Spirit, in her cap. 18. like discerning vnto vs, the sense of the said fol. 79. *Scripture*: for what auayleth it vs to be made *Whita.* certaine of the Bookes, and least vncertaine *con Sta-* of the Sense? Or what reason can our Ad- *ples. l. 9. c.* uersaries alledg, whereby to acknowledge *4. p. 103.* the Churches priuiledg in the one, and de- *Kempn.* ny it (where it is no lesse needfull) in the o- *in Exam.* ther? This inference being granted, vtterly *part. 1.* ouerthroweth the *Private spirit*, in its inter- *pag. 80.* pretation of *Scripture*. *and di-* *uers o-* *thers.*

Animaduersion XLIX.

I T is a demonstration, in confutation of the *Private spirit* interpreting the *Scripture*, to obseue the different, or rather contrary constructions, which *Luther*, and *Caluin*, and others giue of that short sentence: *Hoc est Corpus meum &c. Hic est sanguis meus*, And yet they all do want of their en- (k) *Aue* ioying the said Spirit. And therefore it is *sin. cons.* the lesse wonder, that S. *Amilin* (k) affir- *Maxi-* meth, that it hath euer beene the custome of *mum A-* all Heretikes to flie to *Scripture* alone, as it *rian. l. 1.*

is interpreted by this *Prima Spirit*. The absurdity of which opinion more evidently appears; since it is certaine, that among diuers meere contrary or cōtradiictory points of sayth, the *Scripture* condemneth the one. And yet both the maintainers of the said contrary doctrines do flie to the *Scripture*, as Iudge. Now what madnes is it for a man willingly to couet to appeale to that Iudg, by whom it is certaine his cause shall be condemned? Neither can either of the Litigants put any confidence in the meane of truly interpreting the *Scripture*, to wit, *Prayer, Conference of places of Scripture, knowledge in the Tongues &c.* since all these meane are most vncertaine, euen by the Confes-

(f) Whi- sion of D. Whitaker, thus writing (1): *Mede*
 sak. l. 2. *interpretandi loca scripturae sunt incerta &c.*
 de Ec. The meanes of interpreting the obscure places
 cl. cont. *Scripture* are vncertaine, doubtful, and ambi-
 Bellar. gnous; Therefore it cannot be otherwise, but the
 contr. 1. interpretation it selfe must be vncertaine; Si in-
 quæst. 4. certa, non potest esse falsa, if the interpretation be
 vncertaine, then may it be false. Thus far the
 said Doctour.

(m) L. de
 votis.

Animaduersion L.

pag. 476. T Ouching the depressing of General Coun-
 (n) Lib. cells, Peter Martyr thus writeth: As long
 de Con- (m) as we insist in Generall Councells, so long
 cil. cont. we shall continue in the Papiſts Errors; with
 Bellar. q. whom D. Whitaker conspires in these words:
 6. Generall (n) Councells may erre. Now let us

see

see the great and many disparities, whereby a *Generall Councell* is infinitely aduantaged (in respect of not erring) about the *Primate Spirit* of any one man. First then a *Councell* (I heere only speake of *Generall Councells*) is in *S. Austins* (o) iudgment, *The supreme Tribunal in the Church of God*. The *Primate Spirit* hath but his owne braynes, for the Seate of his Iudicature. A *Councell* receaues its promise from (p) *Christ*, that his assisting presence shall not be wanting thereto. The *primate Spirit*, euen by *Gods* (q) owne sentence, wanteth the certainty of expounding the Word truly. A *Councell* is much reuerenced by the ancient (r) *Fathers*, and acknowledged by diuers of our learned (s) *Aduersaries* to be the only certaine meanes of determining *Controuersies*. The *Primate Spirit* it that, of which we are (t) commanded to doubt: and of whose seducing (u), *God* himselfe in *Scripture* premonisheth vs: And which is much condemned euen by the more moderate (x) *Protestant*. A *Councell* consisteth of many hundred venerable *Douours & Pastours*, gathered from the most remote nations of *Christendome* (and therefore the lesse subiect vpon such their mee-

(o) So doth *S. Austin* terme a *Generall Councell*, Ep. 161.

(p) Where two or three are gathered together in my name &c.

Matth. 18. (q) No prophecy is of any private interpretation, 2.

F 5

ting, *1st. c. 1.*

(t) *Ierom. l. 1. c. 1. Lucifer. Ambr. Ep. 31. Asban Epist. ad Episcopos.* (s) *D. Couel. in his modest Exam. p. 110. &c.* (u) Dearely beloved, believe not euery Spirit: &c. (x) These things I haue written to you, concerning those, who deceaue you. *1st. c. 1. 2. c. 1.* (x) *D. Couel. in his defence of Hooker, p. 38. D. Saravia contra Respons. B. 2. a. pag. 306. and others;*

ting, jointly, and with mutuall consent, to
 stampe any Nouelismes in Doctrine) pre-
 senting that only to be belieued in their
 Canons, which is decreed by the mutuall
 consent of all, or the greatest number of
 them. *The priuat Spirit* is but its owne only
 weening, oftentimes dissenting from others
 of his Brethren in diuers points of sayth.
 To conclude, *A Councell* (as being compo-
 sed of seuerall hundreds of Bishops & Do-
 ctours) hath many members of it, most emi-
 nent for vertue, readines of the *Scriptures*,
 skill in the Tongues; they all besieging
 the cares of God with their daily prayers,
 accompanied with many corporall austeri-
 ties; and all to the end, that God would be
 pleased so to guyde their tongues and pens,
 as that they may decree only such doctri-
 nes, as are agreeable to Gods holy Word. The
Primate spirit, (as being but one man) doth
 want for the most part not only *Vertue*, but
 also those other gifts of the *Understanding*
 about specified, as *Learning, knowledge* in the
Scriptures &c. And as for *Prayer*, and other
 meanes of pleasing God, it reiecteth all this,
 as superstitious and Papisticall, relying (in
 lieu therof) vpon his owne *Enthusiasmes* &
 illuminations from the Lord. And thus
 much touching the balancing of a *Generall*
Councell, with the Protestantical *Primate*
Spirit.

Animaduerſion L I.

If you attempt to charge a Protestant-writer with Corruptions, or lyes in their writings (of which Impoſtures their books are moſt luxuriant) rather inſiſt in a few (& thoſe manifeſt, and vnanswerable) then in a great number ; ſeing, if your Aduerſary can make ſhew to ſalue but three or ſoure of a greater number (the which he may the more eaſely do, by how much the number of his falſifications is greater) the ſuppoſed anſwering of thoſe few (choſen and picked out by him) muſt ſerue, through the partiality of iudgement in his followers, to diſgrace all the reſt of the Corruptions, or falſifications, vrged by you.

Animaduerſion L II.

THE Protestants in falſly alledging the authorities of Authours, do abuſe their Readers chiefly foure ſeueral wayes. Firſt, (which is the moſt vſuall) by concealing ſome part of the alledged authority, Secondly, by adding ſome words of his owne, to make the produced Authour or Father, to ſpeake like a Protestant ; Thirdly by *tranſpoſing the words* of an authority, thereby to make the ſenſe different from the Authors true meaning ; Fourthly, by a wilfull miſtaking, or *confuſion of typos*. I will exemplify theſe foure ſorts in the wryting of Dr. White (a great Impoſtour in his Scripts) in his

(y) Gal.
lat. n.

his booke called: *The way to the true Church*. Well then the said Protestant in p. 119. of his said Booke, produceth a place out of the *Rhemists*, to proue that the *Church of Rome* can make that *Scripture* which is not, and vnmake that to be *Scripture* which is *Scripture*. To ptoue this, he produceth the *Rhemists* (a) thus saying: *The Scriptures are not knowne to be true, neither are Christians bound to receiue them, without the attestation of the Church*. Now heere marke the true words of the *Rhemists*, and therein obserue his impurity of dealing, committed by concealing part of the Sentence, iust crossing his intended drift of vrging that authority. Their true words are these: *The Scriptures, which are indeed of the Holy Ghosts inditing, being put into the Churchestriall, are found, proued, and testified vnto the World to be such, and not made true, altered, or amended by the same; Since the Holy Scriptures in themselves were alwayes true before, but not so knowne to be, to all Christians*. All these are the words of the *Rhemists*; where you see the wilfull concealment of this Parcell, *The Scriptures are not made true, altered, or amended by the Church*, as also that other: *the Holy Scriptures in themselves were alwayes true*, meaning without the attestation of the Church. Now all that can truly be gathered out of this authority, is that the *Scriptures* (though most sacred and true in themselves) cannot be so made knowne to vs (in which words lyeth the

touch

ouch of the point) without the Churches
 attestation. But how farre off, is this from
 M. Whytes vrging of this place?

Touching his imposture, committed in
 adding of words, this one place shall serue:
 Thus then the said D. White produceth, Bel-
 larmine in contempt of the Churches autho-
 rity, saying: *Other meanes may deceine me;*
but nothing is more knowne, nothing more cer-
taine, then the Scriptures. That it were the grea-
test madnes in the world not to beliene the Sc.
 Now in this sentence, these words; viz.
Other meanes may deceine me, are not in Bel-
 larmine, but most subtilly added to the be-
 gining of Bellarmines words, and caused to
 be printed in the same kynd of Character
 or letter, wherein the other words of Bel-
 larmine are printed, thereby to make the
 Reader belieue, that they are words of Bel-
 larmine, wheras they are added (as I labour
 insinuated) for the more depressing of the
 Churches Authority. Now the whole sen-
 tence of Bellarmine was directed against the
Swisseldians, who absolutely denied Scrip-
 ture; and against whom Bellarmine in that
 place disputeth.

Touching the fraud consisting in a cūning
 transposition of words, without adding any
 words to the authority alledged, or concea-
 ling any parcell thereof: this example of the
 foresaid M. Whyte may serue. In pag. 344. of
 his way to the true Church, he produceth for
 the overthrow of the religious vse of Images,
 the

(2) Can.
30.

the Councell of Eliberis, thus saying: No Picture is to be made in the Church, lest that be adored, which is painted on the walls. But the true words of the Canon are these: *Placui picturas in Ecclesia non habere, ne quod colitur & adoretur, in parietibus depingatur*; Jo plea. frib the Councell, that pictures should not be in the Church, lest that, which is worshipped, and adored, be painted on the walls: The nyce difference in words resteth thus; Lest that, which is worshipped, be painted; and as Mr. Whyte translateth: Lest that, which is painted be worshipped. Where the words of the Councell acknowledging the worship of Images, maketh the worship due to them, to be the cause, why they are not painted on the walls (to wit because they were subject to be defaced, either by inuasion of Enemies, or rayne &c.) Now M. Whites translation, only by a subtil transposition of the words, imports that Pictures are not to be worshipped at all.

Lastly, concerning the Calumny resting in a wilfull confusion of tymes, The said Pro. restant in pag. 61. for prooffe of Priests lawfull marriage, produceth a Testimony from Sinesius Bishop of Ptolemis, thus writing of himselfe to a friend: *The sacred hand of Theophilus hath given me a wyfe, and hereupon I testify to all men, that I will neither forsake her, nor pryncipally as an adulterer, keep her Company, but I will pray to God, to send me by her, many and good children.* This Epistle is at large in dowac

downe in (a) *Nicephorus*. Now heere the (a) *Etel.*
 fraud lyeth, that at the tyme, when this E-*bist.* l. 14.
 pistle was written, *Sinesius* was but a Lay-*c.* 55.
 man; but eminent for learning; Now after
 he made himselfe priest, and was created Bi-
 shop of *Ptolemais*, he ever liued separated
 from the company of his wyfe, as fully ap-
 peareth out of *Nicephorus*, in the place a-
 boue alledged. Here then the Ministers de-
 ceit lyeth in applying that to him, as if he
 had bene then *Bishop*, which was spoken
 by him, being a *Layman*; and so *M. White*
 most fraudulently confoundeth those two
 different tymes together, as if all had hap-
 ned at one, and the same tyme.

Animaduerſion LIII.

Y F your Aduersary will vane, that he will
 proue all by *Scripture* only (as most of
 them giue it out they will) then force him
 to draw both his *Premisses* (I meane, both
 his *Propositions*, if so they should be reduced
 to a forme of Argument) from the *Scripture*
 alone; of which Method within two
 Arguments at least, he is certaine to fayle;
 For if he take either of his *Propositions* from
 humane Authority, or from naturall Rea-
 son, you may tell him he leaueth his vnder-
 taken taske of prouing by *Scripture* alone;
 and consequently you may deny his force
 of Argument, though Logically in forme.
 Here I further aduertize, that if your Ad-
 uersary vndertake the part of an Opponent,
 tye

tye him precisely euer to Oppose; which Scene perhaps he (being brought to a *Non-plus*) would flyely transferre vpon you. In like sort, if he taketh vpon him to answer, suffer him not to oppose, though he labour so to do, to free himselfe from answering: Thus be sure, that ech of you keepe your chosen *Station*.

Animaduerſion LIV.

IF the Protestant should seek to expound by way of conference of places, those words of our Saviour: *This is my body, this is my Blood*, figuratiuely, by those other words of his: *I am a vine, I am the Doore &c.* both which Texts, all grant, that they are to be taken figuratiuely; you may heere first answer; that in these and suchlike Sencētes, euer *Predicatur disparatum de disparato*, and therefore the words in their owne nature do inforce a figuratiue construction; but in the words of the *Institution*, there is no such kynd of vauſuall *Predication*, at least in the apparence of the words themselues. Secondly you may demande of your Minister, if he can alledge any passage of *Scripture*, which affirmeth that these words, *This is my body &c.* ought to be interpreted by those words, *I am the Vine, I am the Doore*: If he say he can alledge any such passage, will him to shew it; if the *Scripture* saith not so (as indeed it doth not) then force him to confesse, that it is not the *Scripture*, but him-
selfe,

selfe, that warranteth such Conference of places of *Scripture*:

Animaduerſion LV.

THE Protestant vndertaking to proue euery point by *Scripture*, is obliged to proue his *Negative Articles* by *Scripture*, admitting them for points of faith; as that there is no *Purgatory*; that we ought *not* to pray to the *Saints &c.* and this not from the silence only of the *Scripture*, not speaking of such points; but from it, as the *Scripture* particularly condemneth them. Add hereto that though the *Scripture* by not speaking of *Purgatory*, disproueth the being of it, yet doth not the *Scripture* therefore proue, as an Article of faith (which is a point here to be insisted vpon) that there is no *Purgatory*: Euē as the *Scripture* speaketh nothing in a propheticall Spirit, That *Mahomet* was a false Prophet, and yet though the *Scripture* by not speaking of him, should condemne him for such; it neuertheless followeth not, that we ought to belieue from the *Scripture*, as an Article of faith, that *Mahomet* was a false Prophet; since it is one to say, that the *Scripture* by silence and not speaking of a point, proueth the thing not to be, another thing to affirme, that the *Scripture* proueth the not beleife of the said point, to be an Article of faith.

Animaduerſion LVI.

DEmand of your Aduerſary, if he can alledge any place of Scripture warranting his Infallibility of expounding the Scripture? And if he detort any text of Scripture to that end or purpoſe; tell him, that if ſuch a text ſeeme to make for his not erring in expounding the Scripture, then much more maketh it for the not erring of the whole Church of Chriſt therein; Now if the whole Church of Chriſt hath erred in interpreting Gods Written Word, (as many Proteſtants do teach) then aſke the Miniſter, with what face can he, being but one member of the Church, (and perhaps (b) vnlearned) aſſume to himſelfe a freedome of not erring, when he interpreteth the Scripture?

Animaduerſion LVII.

It is much worth the obſeruatiō, to ba-lace the Spirit of Luther (being Catholike) touching his carriage in manners, with that his Spirit, when he became a Proteſtant. During his being a Catholike in Religion, he thus wryteth of himſelfe; *I living in the (c) Monastery, puniſhed my body with faſting, watching, and prayer. I honored (d) the Pope of meere Conſcience, kept chaſtity, poverty, and obedience; And whatſoener I did, I did it with a ſingle hart, of good zeale, and for the glory of God; fearing grievouſly the laſt day. & deſirous to be ſaued from the bottome of my hart.* Thus he

(b) *Whi-*
tah. de
Ecclef.
cont.
Bellar.
entrou.
2. q. 4. p.
22. Lu-
thar. Ep-
ed Ar-
gon Par-
kms in
his Ex-
poſition
of the
Creed. p.
400.

(c) *Lu-*
ther ad
Galas. c.
2. oſter
the En-
güſb
Transla-
tion

(d) *Lu-*
ther vbi
ſupra.

he, during his continuance in the papacy. But now vpon his change of Religion, and his becoming a Protestant, he turneth his style, and thus wryteth of himselfe: *Quam* (e) *Luth.* (e) *non est in meis viribus &c.* As it is not in *tom. 3.* my power, that I should be no Man; so it is not *Witten.* in my power, that I should be without a Woman. *berg.* It is not in our power, that it should be either *form. de* stayed, or stopped; But it is as necessary, as I *matri-* should be a Man, and more necessary, then to *monio.* eat, drinke, purge make cleane the nose &c. *fol. 119.* And further Luther thus confesseth in an *(f) Lu-* other place: (f) I am almost mad through the *ther in* rage of lust, and desire of Women. And yet *Colloq.* more: (g) I am burned with the great flame *Mensal.* of my untameable flesh. I, who ought to be fervent *fol. 426.* in the Spirit, am fervent in the flesh, in lust, in *(g) Lu-* sloath, &c. Eight dayes are now past, wherein *tom.* I neither writ, prayed, nor studied, being vexed *Epist.* partly with the temptations of the flesh, partly *latin. fol.* with other trouble. This his change of man- *1. 4. ad* ners was such from his former course, as *Philip-* that (h) Sleydam the Protestant sayth: *lus.* *(h) Sley-* thers Profession was not of life or manners but of *lan.* Doctrine; further saying that (i) Luther *Com-* wished, that he were remoued from the office of *m. ut. in* preaching, because his manners, and life did not *english.* answere to his Profession. And hereupon (as *lib. 3. an.* the world knoweth) he perswaded *no. 11.* Catharine Bore to leaue her Monastery, whome he *fol. 109.* after married. Now I referre to any man of *i. Sley-* sincere and impartiall iudgement, whether *Jan vbi* the Profession of Chastity, prayer, Humi- *supra* *fol. 124.* lity,

lity, & desire of saving ones soule (for such was *Luthers* Life in the Papacy) be the effects of a false religion; and contrarywise, insatiableness of lust, & rage towards Women, with contempt of prayer &c. can be a Character of a true Religion: O no. *Non*

(k) *Luc.*(k) *est arbor bona, que facit fructus malos.*

o.

Anima auersion LVIII.

THAT *Luther* changed his Doctrine touching saying of *Mass* as being persuaded by the Diuell, is euident out of his owne words; for *Luther* thus writeth hereof: *Upon a* (c) *time I was suddenly awaked about midnight; Then Satan beganne this disputation with me, saying: Hark ye right learned Doctor Luther, thou hast celebrated Mass. by the space of fiftie yeares &c. And so Luther himselfe in the booke heare alledged in the margēt setteth downe the Arguments at large, which the Diuell vsed to diswade him from saying of Mass; to which Arguments Luther giuing assent, did forbeare after to say Mass. Now that Luther had not this Apparition from any good Angell, appeareth, First, in that *Lutner* rearmeth hym that appeared, *Satan*; Secondly, because *Luther* thus in another place confesseth, saying: *I haue* (d) *no apparition of Angels; I haue made a covenant with the Lord, that he should not send me visions.* Now, that this cannot be onely any Spirituall sight or conference in mynd with the Diuell, as *M. Chark*, and *D. Fulke* do*

(c) *Lu-**th. 7. 10.*7. *Wit-**tenburg*(d) *Lu-**ther in**100. Com.**Class 4.**p 59.*

answere, appeareth, in that *Luther* sayth: *The Diuell spake* (e) to him in a base & great voice, so as he made *Luther* to sweate, & his hart to tremble; againe the same appeareth in that *Luther* saith (as is set downe aboue) that he was first awake; and that then after the Disputation begunne; But howsoever admit it were but a spirituall fight or Disputation, yet in either case the persuations & arguments, wherunto *Luther* heere yealderth, came confessedly from the Diuell; & what difference then is there, whether the Diuell made them to *Luther* by sensible conference, or by inward suggestion?

(e) *Luth.*
tom. 7.
Witten-
berg.

Animaduerſion LIX.

AS *Luther* was instructed by the *Diuel* to impugne the *Maſſe*; so were *Caroloſtadius* and *Swinglius* (two great introducers of Protestancy in those former tymes) in like manner indoctrinated by the *Diuel* against the *Maſſe*. Touching *Caroloſtadius*, (whom *Luther* calleth a *Man* (t) ginen ouer vnto a reprobate ſenſe.) This man impugned the *Maſſe* vnder pretence of *Viſions* and pretended conferences with God, of whome the Booke entituled: *Conſpiracy for pretended reformation*; thus writen: *Caroloſtadius* (g) a preacher profeſſing the Goſpells, &c. attributed much to Cabinet teachers, and pretended conference with God; And yet his pretended viſions were but meere Illuſions of the *Deuill*, of whom euen *Luther* thus ſayth: *Caro-*

(f) *Luth.*
in loc.
com.
Class. 5.
pag. 47.
(g) *Luth.*
tom. 1.
Penenſ.
fol. 63.

(h) In
Theol.
Calu in
Proam.

loftadius (h) had his expositions from the *Denill*.
As concerning *Swinglius* (whom *Conradus Schlusfelburg* the Protestant) calleth a man of unfortunate memory) This man disputed publikly at *Zurick* for the abolishing of the *Masse*, and receaued confessedly his nightly Instruction by Dreame from an Admonisher, (i) whether Black or Whyte (sayth he) I remember not. Which Instruction is acknowledged by Protestants themselves to be a meere Imposture of Satan. For thus hath *Conradus Schlusfelburg* left recorded: Sole, k meridiano clarus est, non Deum verum, sed Diabolum ipsissimum &c. It is more cleare then the Sunne, that not the true God, but the *Denill* himselfe did inspire the Sacramentary Heresy into *Swinglius* by Dreame. Thus far of these three former mayne Impostours, (I meane *Luther*, *Caroloftadius*, and *Swinglius*) all of them receauing their instruction from the *Denill*, for their abolishing and impugning of the *Masse*.

(i) So
writes
Swing-
lius of
himselfe
herein.
tom. 1. l.
de sub.
fid. Eu-
charist.
fol. 149.
(k) In
Theol.
Calui-
nist. in
proam.

Animaduersion LX.

Tiuers *Alia phorists*, or Neutralls in Religion, do maintayne, that whosoever belieueth the *Apostles Creed*, & liuing a good life may be saued. Now that the *Creed* cannot be the Boundary, or limit of Christian sayth is thus proued: First, because though the Protestant and the Catholike do indifferently repeat the *Creeds*, yet they vnder-

stand

stand every Article thereof in a different sense, th'one from the other. For example, *I beleue 1. in God.* The Catholike beleues, that his God no way cooperateth, or worketh sinne in man. The Protestant beleues, that God doth; and therefore Beza sayth, *that God (1) exciteth the wicked will of one; 1. In his thiefe to kill another. And in Iesus 2. Christ, Display his only Sonne.* The Catholike beleues in of *Christ*, who is *God of God*, and equall to his *ous pra*; Father, who suffered Death (*quoad sufficiem. Ales. p. tiam*) for all mankind; A *Sauionr*, who died *101.* only in *Body*, and not in *Soule*; Finally a *Sauionr*, who from his first Conception was endued with all knowledge, wisdom, and prouidence; & exempt from all ignorance, passion, and perturbation: The Protestant belieueth in *Christ*, as his *Sauionr*, yet in all these circumstances touching *Christ*, differently from the Catholike, *Descended 3. into Hell.* The Catholike, by *Hell*, in this place vnderstandeth *Limbus Patrum*, from whence our *Sauionr* did deliuer the soules of the Iust, there delayned till his comming: But the greatest part of Protestants do vnderstand in this article, *the grane*, by the word, *Hell.* He 4. *ascended into Heauen*; both the Catholiks and the Protestants do teach, that *Christ* truly in body ascended vp into Heauen; whereas the *Lutherans* (m) do teach, that *Christ's* Body is in all places, with the *Diminity*; And that therefore it did not after his passion really ascend vp into Heauen,

uen, it being there both before and after his passion. To iudge *s. the quick and the Dead*; The Catholike belieues, that *Christ* shall so iudge man, as that his good works (receauing all their force from our Sauours Passion) shalbe rewarded. The Protestant belieueth, that *Christ* shall reward only a bare, and speciall fayth. The like disparity of the beliefe of the Articles of the *Creed* by the Catholike and the Protestant, might be exemplified in the other following Articles of the *Creed*, here omitted for breuiary. Only I conclude, that seeing it is the *sense*, and not the words only, which makes the *Creed*, which Christians ought necessarily to belieue; and seeing the Catholike & the Protestant belieue the words therof in different, or rather contrary senses; therefore it followeth, that it is not sufficient for a Christian, in respect of fayth, only nakedly to belieue the words of the *Creed*; but he is obliged (if so he expecteth saluation) to belieue the Articles thereof in that sense (and in no other) wherein the *Apostles* did dictate them.

Animaduerſion LXI.

A Dmitting, that both Protestant and Catholike did belieue the *Creed* in a true sense; yet followeth it not, that this beliefe (I meane in respect of beliefe only) were a sufficient beliefe or fayth, for the saluation of Man. The reason hereof is this; because it

is most certaine, that there are diuers points of Christian Religion, houlden necessarily to be belieued in the iudgment both of the Protestant and Catholike, and yet the same points are not contayned or exprellied in the Creed. And to insist in these following: 1. That there are certaine Diuine writings of infallible authority, penned by the Holy Ghost; which we commonly call the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament: 2. That there are spirituall substances, which we call Angells, and that many thousands of them did fall after their Creation, and are become those malignant spirits, which we call Demills. 3. That there is any materiall place of Hell for the wicked, of which we find nothing in the iudgment of the Protestants, seeing they vnderstand the grave, by the word, Hell, in the Creed. 4. That the paynes of the damned shalbe for all Eternity. 5. That Adam presently vpon his Creation did fall from the Grace of God; and thereby transferred Original sinne vpon all mankind. 6. That the world was once drowned for sinne, which inundation is commonly called, Noes flood. 7. That our Saviour, whilest he conuersed here vpon earth, did worke any miracles. 8. That S. Iohn Baptist was our Saviours precursour, or forerunner. 9. That our Saviour did chuse to him certaine Men for his Apostles, who first did preach and plant the Christian sayth throughout the whole world. 10. That Circumcision is now forbidden, as a thing vngodly. 11. That there are any Sacraments of the New Testament, instituted by

uen, it being there both before and after his passion. To *Indge 5. the quick and the Dead*; The Catholike belieues, that *Christ* shall so iudge man, as that his good works (recea-
uing all their force from our Sauours Pas-
sion) shall be rewarded. The Protestant be-
lieueth, that *Christ* shall reward only a bare,
and speciall fayth. The like disparity of
the beliefe of the Articles of the *Creed* by
the Catholike and the Protestant, might
be exemplified in the other following Ar-
ticles of the *Creed*, here omitted for breui-
ry. Only I conclude, that seeing it is the
sense, and not the words only, which makes
the *Creed*, which Christians ought necessa-
rily to belieue; and seeing the Catholike &
the Protestant belieue the words therof in
different, or rather contrary senses; there-
fore it followeth, that it is not sufficient
for a Christian, in respect of fayth, only na-
kedly to belieue the words of the *Creed*;
but he is obliged (if so he expecteth salua-
tion) to belieue the Articles thereof in that
sense (and in no other) wherein the *Apo-
stles* did dictate them.

Animaduerfion LXI.

A Dmitting, that both Protestant and Ca-
tholike did belieue the *Creed* in a true
sense; yet followeth it not, that this beliefe
(I meane in respect of beliefe only) were a
sufficient beliefe or fayth, for the saluation
of Man. The reason hereof is this; because it

is most certaine, that there are diuers points of Christian Religion, houlden necessarily to be belieued in the iudgment both of the Protestant and Catholike, and yet the same points are not contayned or expressed in the Creed. And to insist in these following: 1. That there are certaine Diuine writings of infallible authority, penned by the Holy Ghost; which we commonly call the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. 2. That there are spirituall substances, which we call Angells, and that many thousands of them did fall after their Creation, and are become those malignant spirits, which we call Demills. 3. That there is any materiall place of Hell for the wicked, of which we find nothing in the iudgment of the Protestants, seeing they vnderstand the grave, by the word, Hell, in the Creed. 4. That the paynes of the damned shalbe for all Eternity. 5. That Adam presently vpon his Creation did fall from the Grace of God; and thereby transferred Originall sinne vpon all mankind. 6. That the world was once drowned for sinne, which inundation is commonly called, Noes flood. 7. That our Saviour, whilest he conuersed here vpon earth, did worke any miracles. 8. That S. Iohn Baptist was our Saviours precursour, or forerunner. 9. That our Saviour did chuse to him certaine Men for his Apostles, who first did preach and plant the Christiansayth throughout the whole world. 10. That Circumcision is now forbidden, as a thing vngodly. 11. That there are any Sacraments of the New Testament, instituted by

Christ for the good of mans Soule. Lastly, (to omit some others) 12. That before the ending of the world, Antichrist shall come; who shall be a designed Enemy of Christ, and shall labour to subvert and overthrow all Christian Religion. All these points both Protestant and Catholike do believe, and hould, that the belief of them is necessary to Salvation; And yet not any of these Articles are exprest or set downe in the Creed: Whence I conclude, that the Apostles Creed cannot be a sufficient boundary, to containe and limite an auayleable Fayth.

Animaduerſion LXII.

THe bitter Inuestiues of the Protestants (one against another) are of sufficient force to discouer their dissentions in doctrine, as where *Luther* sayth: *We (n) seriously iudge the Swinglians and Sacramentaries to be Heretiks, and Aliens from the Church of God.* And to confront this, *Swinglius* thus retorteth vpon *Luther*: *Luther (o) is guilty of high blasphemy, against the nature, and essence of God &c.* To descend to the *Puritans* and Protestants in England; we find, that the booke entituled, *Constitutions, and Canons Ecclesiasticall*, printed anno 1604. doth ipso facto, excommunicate the *Puritans* for their maintaining of these positions following, as they are there set downe in the Booke: *The worship of the Church of England, is corrupt, superstitious, unlawfull, repugnant to the*

(n) *Luther* in
Thes.
Cans.
Louvainens.
Thes. 11.
(o) *Swinglianus*.
gl. 10m.
2. in
resp. ad
Luther.
fol. 458.

Script

Scriptures, *The Articles of the Bishops Religion* are Erroneous, their Rites Antichristian &c. Now, the Protestants do thus requite the Puritans, saying: *The (p) Puritans are notorious and manifest Schismaticks cut of from the Church*: And againe: *The (q) Puritans seek to undermyne the foundation of sayth*. Now add hereto, that although infinite other passages might be brought to shew the great discord in sayth among the forraine Protestants; yet there is no one more short Argument th conuincethis point, then to recur to the foure Catalogues of Protestāt Books, set downe in the later end of the Booke called, *The Protestants Apology of the Roman Church*. In which 4. Catalogues, one may find about three hundred Bookes, written in great acerbity of stile, by one Protestant, against another. The names of all which books are taken out of *Coccius his Thesaurus*, or from *Hospinian*; both which Authours dyed many yeares since. Now if so many Bookes of disagreements in sayth, among the Protestants, were made within so short a Tyme; how many hundred more might be alledged, if one did know all other Bookes writtē by the Protestant against the Protestant, since the death of those two former men?

Animaduerſion LXIII.

Many vulgar and vnlearned Protestants (and especially the Calvinists, & Puritans)

(p) M.
Powell in
his con-
fessions.
(q) M.
Parks in
his Ep.
Dedic.

tans) do condemne the Catholike Roman Religion, because it defendeth and practizeth diuers Ceremonies; they ignorantly tearing such Ceremonies, *Idolatrous* and *superstitions*. And there is no one argument more preuayling with such men to auert them from our Catholike Religion, then this: Now, to take a way this scandall or stumblingblock, I say, that if it were Gods good pleasure, to haue his Fayth and Religion of the *old Testament* (which for the tyme was the true Religion) to consist much in Ceremonies, as we see it did fall out in the seuerall *Sacrifices* appoynted by God: In the *Tabernacle*, with the appurtenances, and of what matter, number, and qualities all things shou'd be, as also with prouision of Oyle and Lampes; *The Arke*, *The propitiatory*, *the Consecration of priests*, *the Institution of all vestures, vessels*, and other holy things then belonging to the seruice of God, & all these to be made, performed, and done after a strange and different manner, as we reade in *Exodus*: As also the Institution of *Circumcision* (consisting in paring away a piece of flesh, which serued for freeing Man in that tyme) from *Original Sinne*: the preparing and eating of the *Paschall Lambe*, sprinkling the doores with the blood thereof, and infinit other Ceremonies recorded in the foresaid booke of *Exodus*; I say, if this was Gods vnsearcheable Will to ordaine these things, during the tyme of the

the *Old Law*, wherein he would haue the
 honour, Seruice, and worship exhibited to
 him partly to consist: why then may not
 our *Sanior* institute the Religion & sayth
 of Christians belieuing in him, to be atten-
 ded on with diuers Ceremonies; and yet
 this without any Superstition or Idolatry?
 Now our Aduersaryes common euasion to
 this our Argument, is to say; that God
 instituted Ceremonies in the *Old Law*, to
 serue as *figures*, or *Types* of things, which
 were after to fall out in the *New Law*; &
 which Ceremonies were thē to end, vpon
 the promulgation of the sayth of *Christ*.
 This answer is most impertinent. First,
 because not all the Ceremonies in the *Old*
Law, (but only some) did serue, as figu-
 res or Adumbrations of things to happen
 in the New Testament. Secondly, because
 the Question heere is not, why, or to what
 end the Ceremonies of the *Old Law*, were
 instituted; but only whether Ceremonies
 tending to the worship of God be pious, &
 lawfull? Therefore I conclude, that seeing
 the Ceremonies in the *Old Law* were insti-
 tuted by Gods direction for the worship
 of him, as we read in Exodus c. 8 *Ostendas*
populo Ceremonias, & ritus colendi, (let the
 other secondary end of them be what it
 will) that therefore, and by force of Gods
 proceeding in the *Old Law*, we Christians
 may not thinke strange, that our *Sanior*
 (being God and Man) would now in the
 New

New Law institute (and giue to his Church the like power) some Ceremonies and publicke Rites, wherewith he will be worshipped, and wherein part of Christian religion shall consist. Now therefore let our Adversaries (if they can) giue any true reason why the Ceremonies of the Old Law (being incomparably more in number) shall be accounted lawfull, and yet the Ceremonies of the New Law, or Testament (as long as they are reputed, but Ceremonies) must be reputed *superstitions, and Idolatrous*.

Animaduerſion LXIV.

WE Catholikes charge the Protestants with ancient Heresies. For example, we

(r) L. de shew, how the *Manichees* according to *St. Austin* depriued Man (r) of *Freewill*; How *cap. 45.* *Iovinian* (s) taught, that *Fasting* was not necessary, and *Virginity* was no better, then wedlock or marriage. How *Aerius* (t) taught it to be most vnlawfull to pray, or offer any Sacrifice for the Dead. How the *Arians* (u) reiected all *vnwritten Traditions*: who also (x) perpetrated Sacrilege against the *Sacraments, Altars, Priests, and Religious persons*. How the (y) *Donatists* taught the Church of Christ to be *inuisible*. How the Deniall of the *Reall Presence* was condemned by certain ancient Heretiks of (z) *Ignatius* his

(r) L. de Hares. cap. 45.
(s) Ier. l. 2. cont. Iovin. & Aug. l. Hares. cap.
(t) Anim. l. de Hares. c. 31.
(u) L. 2. cont. Marin. cap. 1.
(x) Alban. in Apolog. pro fuga. (y) Austin l. 4. Vnitatis, cap. 22. (z) Theodores Dial. 3.

yme. How *Zenaias* (a) *Perſa* impugned all (a) *Nl-*
 worship, due to the *Images of Chriſt, and his apb. l.*
saints. Finally (to passe ouer many other *as. ca. 172*
 Protestant Doctrines, first introduced by
 the old *Heretikes* :) how the (b) *Possibility* (b) *le-*
of the Commandements was condemned in *rom. in*
 certaine ancient *Heretikes*. In the condem- *Explic.*
 nation of all which points we are to ob- *Synbol.*
 serue, that the *Heretikes* of those ancient *ad Da-*
 tymes and our Protestants did, without any *mas. 67*
 difference or disparity at all, belieue the *Auſt. de*
 same Heresies, or *Negative Conclusions*, as *Temp.*
 being in no sort varied through any *Gir-ſerm 91,*
 circumstances, or other Collaterall respects.
 Now by way of recrimination the Prote-
 stants seeke to inuolue vs Catholikes with-
 in the said fault of teaching ancient Here-
 sies; But obserue the difference betweene,
 what the Catholikes do teach, and those
 old *Heretikes* touching the objected and
 alledged points, and thou wilt wonder good
Reader, at our Aduersaries for their so char-
 ging of vs. I will exemplify this for breuity
 in this one point, and so *ex vno discite om-*
nes. *D. Fulke* insulteth against the Catho-
 likes, thus saying: *Of the* (c) *Heretikes Cai-*
ni, *you haue learned to call vpon the Angells:*
 he producing *Epiphanius* in prooffe hereof: *ſaye Ca-*
 Now *Epiphanius* his true words of this *thouke.*
 point are these: *Non* (d) *poſſe aiunt aliquos* *p. 22.*
ſoluari &c. The *Heretikes Catani* taught, that (d) *Epi-*
 not any could be ſaued, till they had gone *ph. tie.*
 through all ſinns; and committing therapon *ref. 35.*
 wicked

Wicked things and actions; they called upon the name of such, as were true Angells, and of such as were by them vntuly termed Angells, referring to this Angell, or that Angell (propria actionem) their peculiar action; saying, when they committed their wickednes: O thou Angell, vnto two opere: O Angell, I now vse or perform thy worke &c. Now who can with any shew of truth charge vs Catholikes with the Heresy of the Caiani herein? since it is the variable Identity of an Heresy conspiring in all circumstances, which must insinuate seuerall men within the beliefe thereof: But do we Catholikes teach or belieue touching praying to the Angells, such beastly points, as these Caiani are here charged by Epiphanius to haue done?

Animaduersion LXV.

IT is a mayne point to obserue, whether Protestancy, or our Catholike Religion do more encline, by force of their doctrine, their different professours to Vice & Turpitude of manners, or to Vertue and Piety in conuersation. Since we read: (e) *Vnaquaque arbor de fructu suo cognoscitur.* Let vs then take into our consideration diuers positions of both the Religions. First then touching the Protestants principles: Luther (f) sayth, that the Ten Commandments appertaine not to Christians; with whom Fox conspireth in these words: The ten (g) Commandments were giuen vs, not to do them.

(e) Luc.
6.

(f) Serm.
de Moy-
se.

(g) Fox.
Ad.
Mon. pa.
4335.

This

This being supposed as true, why should a man be punished, for breaking any, or all of them? The Protestants doctrine of *Justification by faith only*, much encourageth a Man to sinne; since thereby neither Good workes are necessary, nor sinne can any way endanger our Salvation. For we find *Luther* thus to teach: *It (h) is impiety to affirm, that faith without Charity, iustificeth not.* And *Conradus Schlüsselburg* (i) will not admit good works to be necessary to Salvation, only *Necessitate presentie*. Now that committing of sinne is not preiudiciall to Mans Salvation, is auerred by *D. Whitaker*, thus writing: *Si quis (k) actum fidei habet, ei peccata non nocent: Sinnes are not hurtfull to him, who hath an Act of faith.* Againe *D. Whitaker* thus further teacheth: *Christiani (*) execratione legis liberantur: if so, why may not a Christian without feare breake the ten Commandements? And according hereto Falk thus teacheth: David (l) even when he committed adultery, was, & remained the Child of God.* To be short: *Luther* thus encourageth Man to sinne, saying: *A (*) Christian baptized is so rich, that though he would, he cannot loose his Salvation, by any sinne (how great soever) unlesse he will not beleeue; and againe, as nothing iustificeth but beleeve, so nothing sinneeth but misbeliefe.* To proceed, the Protestants doctrine of *Reprobation*, which teacheth,

H

cond

does Conferences. (*) *Luth tom. 2. Wittenb. de captivitate. Babil. fol. 74. and Luth. in loc. Com. Class 3 c. 27.*

(h) *Luth. upon the Galatians Englished. c. 2.*

(i) *In Catal.*

Harat. in Epist.

Dedicatio.

(k) *Contra Bel-*

lar. contra

2. q. 5. p. 100.

(*) *Whitaker con-*

tra Camp.

ras. 8. p. 253.

(l) *In his Tower*

disput.

with Ed-

mund

Camp. the se-

cheth, that some Men are condemned to Hell, euen from their Mothers Wombes, though they labour neuer so much in exercise of Vertue, tendeth to the same effect; according hereto *Caluin* (*Instit.* l. 3. c. 23. paragraph. 6.) sayth: *God by his Counsell and Appointment, doth so ordaine, that among men some be borne destined to certaine Death, from their Mothers wombe, who by their perdition may glorify his Name.* In like manner the infallible *Certainety of Salvation* of others, worketh the same effect; since it teacheth that he, that is predestinated to be saued, is assured of his Salvation, notwithstanding the greatest facinorous Sinnes whatsoever, which he shall at any tyme perpetrate. Which *Certainty of Salvation* by our Adversaries Doctrine, is most intallible euen during the committing of Sinne; Since otherwise if vpon the new committing of any Sinne, the party should begin to be vncertaine of his saluation, then followeth it, that his former certainty was no true certainty at all. But now to turne our eye vpon some of our Catholike *Theoremes*, and to obserue, whether they intend either to the increase of *Vice*, or *Vertue*. We teach, that *works* (accompanied with a true sayth) as they receaue their price and vertue from the promise of Christ, and from the dignity of his Passion, do iustify, which Doctrine therefore must needs greatly encourage the believers thereof, to the exercise of Good works.

works. We further teach restitution for wrongs committed. We teach *Confession of sinnes* (an Act otherwise most vngratefull to Mans Nature) and this not to be efficacious, except it be attended on with Repentance; and with a full Resolution, not hereafter to commit the like Sinnes confessed. We maintayne the doctrine of *Purgatory*, which much curbeth a Man from committing of Sinne, since this Doctrine teacheth, that a sinner (if so he make not satisfaction in this world before his death) must suffer temporall torments, after his Death. We in like manner teach, and allow *Fasting*, and yet D. Willeth sayth: *Neither is* (2) *God better worshipped by eating, or not eating.* We also approue the Doctrine of *Single life and Chastity*, to which doctrine Luther (3) is so aduerse, as that he thus writeth: *Marriage is as gold, and Spirituall or single life, as dung.* We further teach and commend *Voluntary Poverty*; the contrary to which doctrine D. (4) *Luth. Willet* teacheth in these words: *He (4) is an enemy to the glory of God, who changeth his rich estate, wherein he may serue God, for a poore.* So iust reason had S. *Edwin Sands* (a most forward Protestant) thus to write euen out of his owne experience in Trauell: *Let the Protestants looke with the eye of Charity vpon those of the Papacy, and they shall find some excellent Orders of Government, some singular helps for increase of Godlines and Denotion, for the Conquering of sinne, for the profitting in Vertue.*

(1) Wil-
let m Sy-
nop. 22.
241. Wit-
tenberg.
in Exeg.

(2) Luth.
(3) Luth.
(4) Wil-
let in Sy-
nop. pag.
241.

(m) In his
relation
of Reil-
gion.

Thus far for a taste, whether the Catholike Religion, or the Protestants do more enclynea Manto *Verine* or *Vice*?

Animaduerſion LXVI.

IT is granted by our Aduerſaries, that *Auſtin*, *Jerome*, *Epiphanius* &c. and the reſt of the Fathers of thoſe ages were maintayners of Popiſtry (as they call it.) And according hereto we find *Luther* to ſay : I (n) regard not, if a thouſand *Auſtins* ſtood againſt me. of *Jerome* he thus writeth: In the (o) writings of *Jerome* there is not one word of true ſayth in *Chriſt*, and perfect Religion; Finally he thus concludeth: The (p) *Apology* of *Philip Melancthon* doth far exceede all the Doctours of the Church, yea euen *Auſtin* himſelf. Well, I now infer from all this, that all the Articles of our Catholike Religion were believed in the dayes of *Tertullian*, *Origen*, and *Cyprian*; all which three Fathers liued preſently after the Second Age. Thus I diſpute: *Auſtin*, (q) *Jerome*, *Epiphanius*, and others, did write againſt *Origen* for his teaching, that the Deuils in the end ſhould be ſaued; againſt *Tertullian* for denying ſecond marriages; againſt *Cyprian*, for his maintayning Re-baptization. Now here I inſiſt. If *Origen*, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*, had diſſented from *Auſtin*, *Jerome*, *Epiphanius*, and other Fathers, in thoſe Catholike

(n) *Luth*
tom. 1.
contra
Regim
Anglia.
fol. 144.
(o) In
Colloq.
Menſal.
de Pa-
trib. &
lib. de
ſeruo ar-
bitrio.
(p) Lu-
ther ubi
ſupra.
(q) Au-
ſtin 4.
gainſt
Origen in
Hareſ.
43. a.
gainſt
Tertull in Hareſ. 86. againſt *Cyprian*, in tom. 3. lib. de Baptism.
2. cap. 7. See alſo *Jerome* in lib. contra Iovinian. & *Vigili-
m. E pipba. l. de Hareſ.*

cholike Articles, wherewith they are truly charged by the Protestants, then without alldoubt *Austin*, *Ierome*, and the rest would in their Catalogues of Heresies, and other their writings, haue as well registred other their opinions for Heresies, in which *Origen*, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian* had dissented from them, as they did register the threeforesaid Heresies: But no such condemnation is extant in their writings; from which consideration we ineuitably conclude, that what Articles of our Roman Religion were taught by *Austin*, *Ierome*, and the rest of those ages, writing of the Heresies of those tymes, all the same Catholike points were also indifferently taught, and maintayned by the foresaid most ancient Fathers, *Origen*, *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*:

Animaduersion LXVII.

WHEREAS some of our Aduersaryes labour (what they can) to keep intercourse with the auncient Fathers; knowing that it is a foule blemish to their Religion, absolutely to break with them; and that thereupon they endeauiour to detort diuers of their authorities against our Catholike sayth; therefore for the better preuenting in generall of all such misaplyed testimonies, I haue thought good to set downe these ensuing Premonitions.

The first, that seeing the Fathers could

not foresee what Opinions of sayth would
ryse in these tymes, that therefore they
could not wryte of all things now questio-
ned, so distinctly and clearely, as now could
be wished. And touching the Fathers im-
possibility hereof; It is acknowledged by

(r) Bez a (r) Bez a. *Kempstius*, D. *Whyte*, and other
in *EpiH.* Protestants. Now therefore it cannot be
Theolog. expected with any shew of Reason, that the
EpiH. 8. Fathers should condemne most articulate-
p. 181. ly, fully, punctually, or *ex professo*, every
Kempni poynt mantayned by the Protestants at this
ius Exa day.

part. 1.

The second Obseruation; That we
fol 80. D. are to vnderstand any obscure saying of a
Whyte in Father, agreeably to his more many playne
his way to and more cleere sayings; And much more
the true then that we ought not to insist vpon any
Church seeming doubtfull saying, against many
Preface more, which are plaine, and for such con-
to the fessed. And therefore *Snecanus* (the Pro-
Read. testant) sayth well herein in these words,
Sect. 7. touching the authorities alledged out of
(s) *Sne-* *Tertullian*: It is (s) fitting, that the fewer be
canus, vnderstood by the more, and lest one speech
Method. should overthrow many, that one is to be ex-
descrip. pounded according to all, rather then against all.
p. 12. 414. Which assertion is most true, & grounded
euen vpon force of Reason.

The third Obseruation; That we ought
to vnderstand the Fathers doubtfull Say-
ing, according to the then common recea-
ded Opinion of the other Fathers. This
caution

caution is obserued precisely by S. *Austin*: For whereas *Julianus* (the Heretike) to proue, that Children were without *Originall Sinne*, objected this sentence out of Saint *Chrysostome*: *We baptize Infants, though they have no finnes*: S. *Austin* teacheth how to vnderstand this obscure sentence saying: *Inuallige* (*τ*) *propria*, vnderstand it of finnes of (*τ*) *Aux* their owne (or *actiual*) and there is no con- *stin, som.* tention; But thou wilt say, why did not *Chryso-* 7. contra *some* add this word: *Propria*? The reason was, *Julian.* because *Chrysostome* disputing in a Catholike *Pelag. lib.* Church, he thought he should not be otherwise *c. 6.* vnderstood; No body was then troubled with such a Question; you not as then wrangling, he speaks securely. Thus far S. *Austin*.

The fourth obseruation; We ought (according to our Aduersaries owne rule) to distinguish, when a Father writeth *Doctrinally* and *Dogmatically*, or *sententially*, and *ex professo*; from that which the same Father writeth *Antagonistice*, and in heate of dispute: For that in this later kind, the Fathers speaking *ad personam*, and being more at- tent and buied, how to conuince and overcome their Aduersaries, then alwaies precisely obseruant or circumspect of their manner of speaking, (which they neuer doubted would be vnderstood otherwise, then according to the Catholike receaued sense) their meaning may the more colourably be mistaken. According hereto some of the ancient Fathers writing against *Pelagius* and

his Sect, who ascribed ouermuch so *Freu-
will*, did not perhaps so fully dispute in the
defence of the Catholike Doctrin of *Freu-
will*, as they might haue done. This course
the Fathers did sometimes take (of which
the (u) Protestants make aduantage) that
thercby they might the more easely con-
uince their Aduersaries Heresy, resting so
much on the contrary syde.

(u) *Kemp-
nis. Exa.
part. 2.
fol. 80. D.
Hum-
frey in
Isiuitism.
part. 2.
rat. 3.*

The fift obseruation (which in part con-
spireth with the former:) The Fathers som-
tymes in a *Rhetoricall* and amplifying man-
ner do vse certaine transcendent speeches
(as also some more moderate Catholikes
haue done) in prayse of our *Blessed Lady*,
or in honour of the *Crosse*, or the like, then
being taken literally, can well be iustified:
But they were more bold so to write, be-
cause they (as then hauing no Aduersaries
to their Catholike doctrine in those points)
might rest assured, that their words would
be taken in that pious sense, wherein they
deliuered them. Of which kind of their
writing our Aduersaries take hould, against
the said Fathers.

The last obseruation heere shalbe, that
when the Catholikes do alledg the Fathers,
the Protestants seek to charge the said Fa-
thers so alleged, with some one Errour, or
other, and therefore say they, his authority
is to be reiected in any other point; which
especially happeneth in *Tertullian*, *Origen*, &
Cyprian, as is about intimated. But to this
you

you may answer, that you produce the Fathers only in such Catholike points, touching the which they were not written against by any other Father; and therefore their authority therein is of force; since it is presumed hereby, that all the other Fathers (and consequently all the Church of God) agreed with them therein.

Animaduerſion LXVIII.

Y Fyour Aduerſaries pretend, that all the writings and memory of Protestants in former ages were extinguished by the Po- (x) Bene-
pes of the ſaid, and after ſucceeding ages, *dictus the*
you may ſhew how abſurd this Aſſertion *third, was*
is; And the reaſon hereof is, in that the Po- *written*
pes of thoſe tymes could not preſage, that *againſt*
Proteſtancy ſhould in theſe our tymes ſway *by the*
more, then any other Hereties condemned *Councell*
in their very tymes; which other Hereties *of Con-*
remayne yet regiſtered to this very day, by *ſtance.*
the acknowledgment of the Proteſtants. *Gregory*
Again, the perſonall (x) vices and faults of *the ſa-*
ſome Popes are recorded in hiſtories, yet to *uantiſh by*
be read. Is it then probable, that the Popes *Beno.*
were ſo ſollicitous to extinguish all remem- *Eugenius*
brance of the Proteſtant ſayth, & yet con- *(the*
tent to ſuffer their owne leſſe juſtifiable *Pope)*
lines of themſelves and their predeceſſours *was writ-*
to be regiſtered, for all ages after to perueſe *ten a-*
Laſtly, in the Canons of eech age, there is *gainſt by*
made mention of all particular Hereties of *the Coun-*
theſe tymes condemned by the ſaid *cell of*
Baſil,

gells; Stands it then with any shew of Reason, that the Pope, and the *Conncells* should be so voyd of iudgment, as carefully to register all other impugned Heresies, and on the other syde, as carefully to suppress all arising opinions of Protestancy?

Animaduersion LXIX.

YF you intend to bring and obiekt any foule and wicked sayings (especially out of *Luther*, against the *Blessed Trinity*, or about his acknowledged Lust, and sensuality) be carefull to note the Edition of the Booke, wherein such sayings are to be found; For in some later Editions of his workes, many such sentences are for very shame left out, and vnprinted: And thereupon there are diuers Protestants, who vtterly deny, that euer any such wicked, or sensuall words were written by him.

Animaduersion LXX.

OVr Aduersaryes labour by seuerall wayes to depresse the force of *Miracles*, exhibited in prooue of the Roman Religion: For first, some of them do deny the working of all *Miracles*; and to fortify this their denial, they thinke it sufficient, if they can produce but any one or two strange relations, supposed to be *Miracles*, and yet after discovered to be but forgeryes, to the disgracing of all true *Miracles*; but this euasion is weake, seeing by force thereof we should

should deny all the bookes of *Scripture*, because some false wrytings were in the Primitive Church obtruded vnder the names of the Apostles, as (y) *Austin*, and (z) *Ensebins* do record. Again if they will deny all *Miracles*, they may also by the same reason, deny all History, eyther prophane or Ecclesiasticall. Therefore if we will ascribe so much confidence to the wrytings of *Ensebins*, *Zozomene*, *Austin*, *Ierome*, and others, as we do to the *lynies of Linus*, or *Commentaries of Cesar*, or to *Speeds Cronicle*, we cannot reiect all *Miracles* for forgeries & vntruths. Other of our Aduersaryes confesse the doing of many *Miracles* vrged by the Catholykes, but then they ascribe them to the power of the Diuell, and do commonly stile them: Antichristian (a) *wonders*, and *lying signes*. But against this subterfugion, I say, it cannot be applyed to the *Miracles* wrought in the primitive Church, and recorded by *Zozomene*, *Austin*, *Ierome*, and others long before the comming of *Antichrist*, since most of our Aduersaryes do place *Antichrists* first comming, in *Boisace* who was Pope in the yeare 1006. long after the dayes of the former Fathers: Secondly I say, that our Aduersaryes in ascribing the *Miracles* to the working of *Antichrist* & (consequently of the Diuell) do ouer neere interleage with the lewes condemning the *Miracles* of Christ in these wordes: *This man* (c) *casteth not out Demills*, but his Treas

(y) Cont
Aduers.
leg. or
prophet.
L. 1. c. 20.
(z) Hist. l.
3. c. 19.
(a) So do
the Cent.
calls them
Cent. 4.
col. 1449.
or Cent. 5
1486. In
like man-
ner O-
stand, also
stilesb
them
Cent. 10.
11. 22.
(b) So
doth D.
Willis
teach in
his Synop.
p. 120.
D. Pulke
in his
answere
to a coun-
tiff. Cath.
p. 10. D.
Downe
namim
but his Treas

vise of *Antichrist*, lib. 1. pag. 4. (c) *Math. 1.*

(d) In
Comment
Catech,
21.

but by *Belsheub* the Prince of *Devills*. Again I say, that the Protestant *Ursinus* truly sayth, that the (d) Power of the Miracles of *Antichrist* are not true Miracles, but such, as the Order of Nature observed, may be effected by the decaye of men, or *Devills*: But diuers miracles are recorded, which transcend the power of the *Deuill*; as to stay the flux and reflux of the sea, or to cure incurable diseases, without applying any secondary meanes, and such like &c. Of which there are many miracles recorded by the former Fathers. Thirdly, I auer that the Miracles of the *Deuill* are euer done to some vaine and pernicious end, and not for the good of the particular person, vpon whom they are wrought. Fourthly, if the *Deuill* could effect such stupendious workes, how canst thou see it, that he would neuer concurre with condemned, and on all sydes acknowledged miscreants, to strengthen and countenance thereby those mens misbeliefe, and Heresies, I meane with *Simon Magus*, *Porphyry*, *Iulian the Apostata*, *Mahomet* &c. and other Sects condemned, euen by the Protestants for most erroneous? Lastly I conclude, that our Aduersaries in condemning all Miracles, either but as forgeries, or as the Works of the *Deuill*, do charge diuers Princes, Commonwealths, Ecclesiasticall persons, and infinite multitudes of people both of former and later tymes, with extreme simplicity (yea Lunacy) in suffering such

such forgeries and delusions to be obtruded upon them. I will adioyne hereto the miraculous preservation for many hundred yeares of certaine Relicks: I will passe ouer the vncorrupted bodies of many Saints euen till this day, and will insist in the miraculous preservation of the *Eucharist*, stabbed with knyfes by the Iewes many scores of yeares since (if not some hundreds) and yet remaining to be yearly seene, euen with spots of blood, at the chiefe Church in *Brussells* in the lowe Countreyes. What can our Aduersaries answere hereto? Yf they grant the miracle, they withall grant the truth of the Doctrine of the *Real Presence*: To deny it, by saying, that when one *host* is corrupted through tyme, another is secretly thrust in the former place, is more then absurd: For would the Princes of those Countreyes, the Lords, Bishops, Prelates, or other Religious persons, and the whole Communalty suffer themselves to be thus abused from tyme to tyme with such impostures, but that they would be most desirous to find out and disery all such wicked stratagemes and deuises? Truly I do not see, what answere in full weight of Reason can be giuen hereto, to conuince the iudgment of any sufficient Man.

Animaduersion LXXI.

THat Catholike Religion affordeth Salvation to the Professours thereof, is produced

ued severall wayes euen from our Aduersaries owne penne: And first: Because our Aduersaries do teach, that the Church of Rome (notwithstanding her presumed Errours) is the true Church of Christ; & consequently her Professours capable of Salvation. According hereto thus writeth D.

(d) *L. of Field'd*: We doubt not, but that Church, in the which the Bishop of Rome with more then Laci- Church. ferlike pryde exalted himselfe, was not withstanding the true Church of God; and that it held a

(e) *In his Defence against* saving profession of the truth in Christ. D. Som- auereth the same verity in these words: If

(c) *you think*, that all the Popish sort, which dyed in the popish Church, are damned, you think absurdly, and do dissent from the indig- ment of all learned Protestants. With them

(f) *In his Defence of M. Hooker* conspireth (to omit others) D. Conell thus writing: We (f) *affirme* them of the Church of Rome to be a part of the true Church of Christ, and that those, that liue & dye in that Church, maybe saved. Another Reason may be taken

(g) *So teach the Deuines of Geneva* from the lawfulness (euen in the iudgment of the learned Protestants) of Children of Papists (as we are stiled) whether they be Baptized by Catholike Priests, or Protestant Ministers: And the cause of the lawfulness thereof is deliuered by the Protestants in these words: Because (g) *We affirm*, that those Children are comprehended

principles disputed at Gen. p. 178. the same is taught by D. Whitgift in his Defence, pa. 613. by M. Hooker. Ezechj pol. l. 1. p. 131. & by others.

within the Covenant of eternall life, by means of the sayth of their Parents. A third Reason of the Protestants true iudgment herein concerneth the Fathers of the Primitiue Church in generall; who that they liued & dyed Papists is most euident, by what hath bene confessed aboue by our Aduersaries. Now, of them *Carrwright* thus writeth: I (h) doubt not, but that diuers Fathers of the *Grecke Church*, who were patrones of *Free-will*, are saved. The like charitable opinion of the Fathers (though Papists both liuing & dying) is deliuered by (i) *D. Whitaker*, notwithstanding the Fathers Doctrine, touching *Satisfaction* and *Merit of Works*. Finally the Protestants iudgement is also herein manifested in their commonly giuing, in their writings and speeches, to *Austin*, *le. Camp.* *some*, *Ambrose*, and the rest (whom they acknowledge to Professe and dye in our Catholike sayth and Religion (the name and title of *Saint*, as *S. Austin*, *S. Jerome*, &c.

(h) *Carrwright*, in his Replye to *D. Whit-gusts Defence*. p. 81.
(i) *Contra Rat.* pag. 78.

Animaduerſion LXXII.

Y F it be vrged, that the Deniall of *Free-will* (for exâple) was taught by *Manichæus*; and consequently that the Protestant sayth therein is as ancient, as those Primitiue tymes; it may be replied, that this particular Heretike, or that particular Heretike, did teach but one or other Protestant Article in those dayes, and were instantly written against for such their *Innovations*; the said

said Innouatours being Catholike in all other points. And therefore you may truly infer, that the vrging of such examples is merely impertinent, either for the proofof the Antiquity of the Protestant Religion, or for the Visibilty of the Protestant Church in those dayes.

Animaduerſion LXXIII.

YF you dispute with any Protestant by writing, or interchange of letters, write nothing, but *Matter* with as much compendiousnes, as the Subiect will beare, without any *Verball Excursions*, or digressions: For this proceeding will force your Aduersary to reply (if he will reply) to the *Matter*; For otherwise leauing the matetiall point, which is chiefly issuable, and to be handled, he will shape a reply to other lesse necessary stufſe deliuered by you; And then his Reply must passe abroad (by the help of many partiall tongues) for a full answer to your whole Discourse.

Animaduerſion LXXIV.

WHereas you may alledge diuers acknowledged Heresies (both in the iudgment of Protestants, & Catholiks) out of the Bookes concerning diuers persons, who belieued some few points of Protestancy, recorded in the said Bookes; here I speake of *Waldo*, *Wicliffe* &c. Now if here you Aduersary Disputant doth auouch (as many

many Protestants do) that these Heresies were falsely obtruded and fathered vpon the said presumed Protestants by their Enemies; you may here reply, that to affirme this is against the force of all Reason; For seeing the same Bookes do make indifferent mention both of the Protestant opinions, and of the other Heresies, defended by the same Men; either the said Bookes are to be belieued in both, or to be reiected concerning both: Yf the first, then it is certaine, that those men did belieue those acknowledged Heresies: Yf the later, then the said Bookes are not of sufficient authority to proue, that there were any Protestants in those ages.

Animaduersion LXXV.

I N your proofes drawue from *Scripture*, labour to be much practised in the Protestant Translation of it; of which infinite places make for the Catholike Cause, euen as the *Scripture* is translated by the Protestant; For this Course gauleth them far more, then if you insisted only in the Catholike Translation.

Animaduersion LXXVI.

I Will here set downe certaine Observations, which will easely solve all difficulties or Argument whatsoever, rising from *Scripture* or *Fathers*, against *Communion* vnder one kind only.

I

1. First,

1. First, whereas sundry places of *Scripture* and *Fathers*, do speake indifferently, or only make mention of *Communion* vnder both kinds, or do affirme the vse thereof to be lawfull; yet from hence (which is the point issuable) cannot be inferred any precept of Christ as necessary to Saluation.

2. Secondly, when such places are vnder- stood, which contayne in them a *Precept*, the same places are either vnderstood of Priests (who do sacrifice) whose bond is different from theirs of the Laity : Or els they concerne only the tyme, and place, when & where, that custome of both kinds was obserued ; for the custome of the Church, whether it be generall in the whole Church, or particular in some notable place thereof, as in one Country, Kingdome, Prouince &c. hath the bynding force of a Law, or *Precept* : And yet the same custome once ceasing, the bond of all authority produced in defence of the said custome, doth also cease.

3. Thirdly, In the allegation of any authority for *Communion* vnder both kinds, we are diligently to obserue, whether the same maketh mention of *Formes*, or kinds (to wit, of bread and wyne) or only of the things contained vnder the said kinds, to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ. For in the examples of the first we shall seldome or neuer find any one, which importeth a *Precept*, or *Necessity* : And though of the latter

innumerable authorities may be brought; yet they are all impertinent; seeing the *Body and Blood* of Christ are as truly receaved vnder either kind alone, as vnder both: And the *Precept* in that Case determineth only the *thing*, and not the *Kind*.

4. Fourthly, diuers authorities alledged for *Laicall Communion* vnder both kinds, are vnderstood only of *Spiritual* (not *Sacramental*) receaving.

5. Fifthly, though the Fathers sometimes signify the *Communion* to be most complete and perfect, when it is administred and receaved vnder both kinds, in regard that the effects thereof are more liuely expressed; yet this perfection is but only accidentall; and therefore from hence cannot be inferred a *Precept*, or *Necessity*: For (for example) innumerable things there are, which accidentally would conduce to *Grace* and *Salvation*, which yet do not fall vnder any bond or Command.

6. Sixthly, the Fathers sometimes reprouing such as abstayned from the Chalice, do only speake against the *Manichees*, and some other Heretikes, who vpon a certaine superstition abhorred *Wyne*, as foolishly thinking it to be the gaulc of the Deuill, as *S. Austin* (k) relateth; and withall denied Christ our Sauour to haue had true blood; which nothing concerneth this our Catho-
(k) *Ant-
stin l de
Heres.
cap. 46.*

7: Seauently, (which is greatly to be
I 2
noted

noted) that: whereas the only point in Controuersy is, whether *Christ* our Sauiour gaue absolute command, not only to Priests, but also to the Laity, to receaue vnder both kinds; As also whether the Primitiue Church did, (vniuersally for tyme & place, and as matter of necessity) obserue the same; yet no one testimony of *Scripture* or Doctour can be produced, either expressly, or by necessary consequence, affirming the same.

8. Eightly aud lastly, admit any authority could be produced, from a Doctour most ancient and learned, which expressly and in direct termes should contradict our Catholike Doctrin; yet the same with any man of iudgment and vertue, could beare no force against the infallible Decrees of Oecumenicall, and Generall Councils of Gods Church. Seeing not the Church vnto the Doctours, but the Doctours and their writings ought, and are to be submitted to the Church. And this obseruation hath as much waight and force in many other points of Controuersies. Thus far touching the several obseruations concerning Communion vnder both, or one kind only.

Animaduersion LXXVII.

THat sentence of *Chrysostome* is most true *Prout* (1) *Heresiarche* *nomen*, ita *Secta* *uocatur*. To whose iudgment herein *D. F.* subscribes in these words: *Surely* (m) *it is*

(1) *Homil. 33. in
act. A.
post
(m) Of
the
Church.
(. 2. 6. 9.*

to be denied, but that the naming after the name
of Men, was in the time of the primitive Church,
peculiar and proper to Heretiks, and Schisma-
tiks. Which sentences do deadly wound the
Innouatours of these tymes, who take their
Denomination from *Luther*, *Swinglians*, *Cal-*
uin &c. And so for distinction sake, they
are termed, *Lutherans*, *Swinglians*, *Calvinists*
&c. as signifying thereby, that they take
their doctrine and fayth from those parti-
cular men. Neither can our Aduersaries re-
port vpon vs this Argument, by saying that
the word, *Papist*, is imposed vpon vs. This
prooueth nothing; seeing as in those ancient
Heretiks, (I meane the *Arians*, *Entichians*,
Manichees) so in our Sectaries (to wit the
Lutherans, *Swinglians*, *Calvinists* &c.) these
names are giuen only out of necessity, & to
distinguish their doctrines from all other
doctrines. But now the name, *Papist*, was
coyned but lately by *Luther*, and this not
out of necessity, but of reproach: our fayth
and Doctrine being acknowledged to haue
existed in the world many hundred yeares,
before *Luthers* tyme. Again the word, *Pa-*
pist, is not restrayned to any one Pope, or to
any peculiar Doctrine taught by the pre-
sent Church of Rome; but it is indifferent-
ly extended to all Popes, and to all the
doctrines taught by the said Popes: And
for the names of *Franciscans*, *Bernardins*
&c. in the Catholike Church, it is cleare;
that these Names are not imposed for

change of Fayth; but only for Institution of severall Degrees of a Vertuous, and Religious Life.

Animaduerſion LXXVIII.

IN any notable change of Religion, theſe things following are to be demonſtrated or pointed out. Firſt, the *Author* of ſuch a change (as aboue is intimated.) Secondly, the *New Opinion* or Doctrin. Thirdly, the *time*, in which this new Doctrin was broached. Fourthly, *the place*, in which it was taught, Fifthly, and laſtly the *Perſons*, who did oppugne and reſiſt this New Doctrin at its firſt appearance. None of all which circumſtances can be ſhewed concerning our Catholike Religion, ſince the tymes of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; But all theſe Circumſtances can be made playne, and diſcovered in the Proteſtant Religion; therfore it demonſtratiuely followeth, that the Catholike Religion is the ſole ancient Religion, firſt vncchangeably proceeding from the Inſtitution of our Sauour, & that Proteſtancy is but Innouation and Nouelty, as but lately receauing its being, from ſome other particular Innouatours.

Animaduerſion LXXIX.

NO Proteſtant hath more laboured to ſearch into the change of our Catholike Religion, then *D. Whitaker* hath done, who inſiſteth in diuers particular Catholike Do-

&ripts;

trines; vndertaking to shew by whom (as
 innovations) they were first brought in:
 Therefore I will touch all his Instances,
 shewing them to be more ancient (euen by
 the Confession of other learned Protestants)
 then the persons, or tymes, to whom they
 are ascribed by the said D. Whitaker. Only for (n) D.
 greater breuity I will content my selfe with Whitak.
 one only acknowledgment (instead of ma- Cont.
 ny) of one learned Protestant in each exam- Duraum
 ple. To begin. D. Whitaker sayth: 1. It is (n) l. 7. pag.
 manifest, that who first deliuered Purgatory for 480.
 a certaine Doctrine, was Gregory the Great. But (o) In
 against this bare testimony, I oppose the his Con-
 acknowledgment of D. Faile, thus writing: futations
 (o) Tertullian, Austin, Cyprian, Ierome, (all of Pur-
 more ancient then Gregory the Great) and gatory.
 a great many more, do witness, that Sacrifice for P. 101. &
 the Dead (and consequently the doctrine pag. 103.
 of Purgatory) is the Tradition of the Apo- & 103.
 files. (p) Whi
 tak con-
 tra Du-
 raum. p.

Secondly, D. Whitaker sayth: Innocentius
 the third, was the first, that instituted auricular
 Confession for Necessary. This Innocentius li-
 ued in the year 1200. To free this Pope, (q) Cima-
 the (q) Centurists speaking of the ancient turists,
 Churches vsage, do charge Cyprian, and Ter- Cent. 3. c.
 tullian (who liued in the second and third 6. col. 127
 age) For their teaching private Confession enen (r) D.
 of thoughts, and lesser sinnes. Whita.

Thirdly, D. Whitaker (r) affirmeth that l. contra
 Pope Siricius was the first, that annexed perpe- Duraum
 nall Chastity to the Clergy men, or Ministers of p. 480.

(s) Kemp
nit. in
Exam.
Concil.
Trid. p.
30. &
601. the word: This Instance is ouerthrowne by
the Confession of *Kempnitius* (s) who doth
reprehend *Ierome*, *Epiphanius*, *Origen*, *Am-
brose*, (all far more ancient, then this *Siri-
cius*) for their impugning the supposed law-
fulness of *Priests Mariage*.

Fourthly, *D. Whitaker* sayth: *Qui* (t)
(t) *D. Transubstantiationem primus excogitauit*, is
Whit. *suit Innocentius tertius in Concilio Latera-*
vbi supra nensi; who first inuented *Transubstantiation*,
pa. 480. was *Innocentius* the third in the Councell of *La-
teran*, which Councell was houlden in the
yeare 1215. But I take this obiection away
by the authority of *D. (u) Humfrey* (as els
(u) *Te- where I haue shewed) who writeth that Gre-*
uisism. *gory the Great, and Austin* (both which li-
part. 2. ued a thousand yeares since) at their first
vas. 3 pa. plantation of Christian Religion here in
612. England, to vse the Doctours owne words,
Inuenerunt Transubstantiationem:

Fiftly, the *D.* further proceedeth, saying:
(x) *Con-* who (x) first inuented to say, that the body of
tra Du- *Christ frangitur sensibiliter tractatur, & den-*
raum, l. *tibus atteritur*, was *Nicolaus* the Second. To
7.c. 480. this I answer, saying: it is but a verbal obiection, and quarreleth at certain phrases &
words; which words are to be vnderstood
in a sober and restrayned construction; and
therefore we find the like Phrases to be v-

(y) *Chry-* sed by *S. Chrysostome* (far more ancient
soft. in then *Nicolaus* the second) saying: *Christus*
loan. *non* (y) *se tantum videri permittit desideranti-*
Homil. *bis sed & tangi, & manducari, & dentes car-*
45. *ni*

ni sibi infert: Christ doth not only permit himself to be seene of those who desire to see him, but also to be touched, and eaten by them, and their teeth to be fastned in his flesh. A point so true, (2) *And* that *Jacobus Andreas* (a famous Prote-^{dras in}stant, but a Lutheran) answereth this very ^{confutat.} objection of *Nicolas*, saying; (2) *Nicolas* ^{loannis} *nihil continet, quod in scriptis Orthodoxorum* ^{Grinai p.} *Patrum (Chrysostomi imprimis) non conti-* 274-275 *netur.*

Sixtly, *D. Whitaker* (a) instanceth in Pope (a) *D.* *Calixtus*, for introducing the Fast of Lent, *Whitak.* and of *Quatuor Temporum*. But *Kempnitis* ^{vbi supra} thus writeth hereof: *Ambrose*, (b) *Maximus*, ^{pa. 480.} (c) *Kemp* *Taurinensis*, *Theophilus*, *Ierome*, and others, do ^{nit. in} *affirme the fast of Lent to be an Apostolicall* *Exam.* *Tradition*; and thus they make it more an- *Council.* cient (by the Confession of *Kempnitis*) *Trid.* then the tymes of *Calixtus*. ^{part. 2.}

Seauenthly, and lastly, *D. Whitaker* thus ^{pag. 39.} writeth: *Boniface* (c) the third, was the first, (c) *D.* that entituled the Roman Church to be *Caput* *Whita-* *omnium Ecclesiarum*, The Head of all Churches. ^{vbi supra} But this is refuted by *D. Whitaker* himself, ^{pag. 480.} who affirmeth, that (d) *Zozimus*, *Bonifacius*, (d) *D.* and *Celestinus* did challenge superiority ouer o- *Whitak.* ther Bishops, by forging a Canon of the Nicene ^{vbi supra} Council: so inconstant is this Doctour in ^{pag. 480.} his Instances; which later assertion of his touching *Zozimus*, *Bonifacius*, and *Celestine*, (though it be most false, so far as concerns any forging of a Canon, and only in-vented by our Aduersaries) yet is frees *Bonifacius*

misface the third, from this supposed Innouation.

Thus far now of *D. Whitakers* Instances: where we are to vnderstand, that some of the former Popes did command a more strict obseruation in some points; as in not Marrying of Priests, touching *Auricular Confession*, touching the *Fest of Lent*, then afore was obserued: Now *D. Whitakers* calumny here lyeth, in a willfull confounding of the *First Institution* of a thing, with a *Re-nouation*, or practise of the same thing: which imposture is aboue noted.

Animaduersion LXX.

I Will here draw a *Porisma*, or Resultancy out of this last Animaduersion. It is this: Whereas we see such Protestant Doctours (and those of the greatest Rank) who labour by all reading and meanes whatioeuer, to shew the beginning of our Catholike points; and after all their disquisition and search they cannot find any colour or pretext to insist in more, then *Fine or six* points to be innouated; and yet such their Instances evidently discovered to be of no force, but most falsely alledged: Therefore the Reader may here iustly presume, that no instances of Innouation can be but suggested, or imagined to be giuen of the Change of the Church of Rome, touching the doctrines here following: To wit, 1. *Vi-*
sibility of the Church, 2. *Praying to Saints*. 3.

Free

Free will, 4. Merit of Works, 5. Works of Supererogation, 6. Indulgences, 7. Monachism, 8. Limbus Patrum, 9. Images, the 10. Adoration of the blessed Sacrament, 11. Communion under one kind, 12. Uniuersality of Grace, 13. The Necessity and vertue of the Sacrament, 14. Inherent Iustice, 15. the knowledge of Christ, as Man; 16. His being God of God, and diuers others. Here I say, no colour (how little soeuer) can be giuen of Innouation, or change in any of these our Catholike Articles. For if any pretext, or shadow could be afforded of any change of these, or of any other doctrines herenot specified, D. Whitaker, or some other of our learned Aduersaries would not haue beene altogether silent therein.

Animaduersion LXXXI.

THE Catholike Doctrine touching Praising to Saints, is chiefly deliuered in these ensuing propositions. The first: It is not lawfull to pray to Saints (as Anthonys, or principall dispensers of Diuine Benefits) to obtaine from them either Grace or Glory, or the meanes of obtaining eternall felicity; since so to pray to them, were to make them Gods. And therefore when it is said: *Our Lady helpe me* &c. we are not to insist in the naked words, but in the sense; which is; *Our Lady help me by her intercession, and prayers to her Sonne;* no otherwise then S. Paul sayth of himselfe. To (e) all men I am become all things, that I may save all; meaning, by his preaching, and prayers for them.

(e) 1. Cor. 9. *De omnibus faciens salu- uos.*

The

The second. *Saincts are not our immediate Mediatours by way of Intercession to God; but whatsoeuer they demand, or obtayne for vs, they demand and obtaine it through Christ, and his Merits*: and according hereto we find, that all prayers of the Church made to Saincts, end with this clause: *Per Christum Dominum nostrum*.

The third. *The Saincts, which reigne with God, do pray for vs, not only in generall, but in particular*. This is proued from those words in Ieremy: *If Moyses (f) and Samuell shall stand before me, my soule is not towards this people*. From whence it is inferred, that *Moy- ses and Sammel* (then being dead) might & were accustomed to pray for the people of Israel. I will conclude this passage with refuting the chiefe Argument of our Aduersaries touching praying to Saincts, which is taken, in that the Saincts in their iudgment do not heare vs. Now the weakenes of this Reason is discouered, in that *damned Spirits, and Demils*, being far absent from their *Witches and Coniurers*, do neuerthelesse heare their *Invocations and Coniurations*, as is warranted by all experience. Shall any man thinke then, that the *B. Saincts of Heauen* are deprived of hearing the Prayers made vnto them? Since otherwise it would follow, that *spirituall Substances* by loosing of Heauen (I meane the *Deuills* by their fall) did obtayne greater prerogatiues and excellencies, then the *Soules of the Saincts* do by

(f) Iere-
mye. 15.

gaying and ascending vp to Heauen. An
turdity incompatible with the Goodnes,
Wisdome, and Charity of God.

Animaduerſion LXXXII.

¶ When a Catholike ſigneth himſelf with
the *ſigne of the Croſſe*, he but only impli-
cely deſireth that, by this *ſigne*, which ex-
plicitly, and by mediation of words he de-
ſireth by prayer; For ſeeing the *ſigne of the
Croſſe* doth figure out to the eye our *Sa-
uiours Paſſion*: and ſeeing the ſecret deſires
of the hart are manifested & made knowne,
as well by ſignes of the body (as dumbe
men, and ſuch as cannot ſpeake, are accuſto-
med to make) as by Prayers, and words of
the tongue: Therefore if it be lawfull
for me with the tongue to pray, that God
will forgiue my Sinnes through the merits
of Chriſt his Death and Paſſion; it muſt
needes then be conſequently lawfull forme
to pray to him to the ſame end, without
words, by making the *ſigne of the Croſſe*: ſee-
ing the making of this *ſigne* with an inten-
tion of inward Prayer (the *Croſſe* being the
badg and remembrance of our Sauours
death and Paſſion) is all one, as to pray in
words, by vertue and force of the ſame
death and Paſſion: Since the hand in this
caſe by making the *ſigne of the Croſſe*, doth
ſupply the place and office of the tongue.

That many Miracles haue beene wrought
by the *ſigne of the Croſſe* (forbearing the te-
ſtimonies

(g) *Vide* testimonies of the ancient (g) Fathers I will
 Tertul. here content my self with the acknowledg-
 in init. ment of D. Couell, thus writing: No (*) man
 Scorpiaci. can deny, but that God (after the Death of his
 Epiph. Sonne) manifested his power to the amazement
 Hæres. of the World, in this contemptible signe, as being
 30. Na- the instrument of many miracles.
 tian?.

orat. in *Animaduerfion* LXXXIII.

Julian. A Ll men know, that praying vpon beades
 Nyssen. is but the repetition of the same prayers
 vita Gre- seuerall tymes; the beades seruing only but
 gorij to number, or count the tymes. This cu-
 Tbeuma stome is warranted by the Example of our
 surg. A. Saviour; who being in the Garden, did re-
 than, in peate one and the same prayer (to wit, Iste
 vita An- be (h) possible, let this Cup passe from me) three
 tonij. le- seuerall times. Again it it be lawfull to say
 roma in the Lords prayer seauen times a weeke, and
 visa presume many Protestants will confesse
 Pauli that they do; why not then is it lawfull to
 primi repeate it seauen tymes or more euery day?
 Heremi- Lastly, once granting the Prayer to be
 ta. Au- good; the goodnes of it doth warrant the
 Rin in l. often repetition of it. The precise number
 22. de Ci- of repeating one and the same prayer (a-
 suit. Dei- mong Catholikes) hath a Mysticall refer-
 (*) D. rence; either to the number of Dauids Psal-
 Couell in mes; or to the number of the yeares that
 his ans- our B. Lady liued here vpon earth, or to the
 were to number of our Saviours wounds; or to the
 M. Burg. number of the persons of the most Blessed
 (b) Math. Trinity; or to some other such Mystery.
 c. 26.

The antiquity of praying vpon Beades is
 confessed by the Centurists (i), and Oſian- (i) Cent.
 ler (k), to haue beene twelue hundred yea- 4.col.
 res ſince. In further antiquity of praying v- 1119.
 pon beads, Zozomene thus relatech of Paul (k) Epis.
 the Monke: *In dies (l) singulos trecentas ora- Cent. 4.
 tiones Deo, velut tributum quoddam reddidit, p. 454.
 &c. Paul enery day did ſay three hūdred prayers l. Hiſt.
 to God, as a certaine tribute; and leſt through l. 6. c. 302
 forgetfullnes he might erre in number, he kept
 three hundred litle ſtones in his boſome, and at
 ending of enery Prayer he caſt away a ſtone; &
 when he had caſt away all his ſtones, then it was
 euident to him, that he had performed his ſaid (m) L. 8.
 number of three hundred Prayers.*

Apoſt.
 Conſtit.
 c. 35.

Animaduersion LXXIV.

The benediſtion of Creatures to ſpirituall (n) De
 ends (and particularly of Holy water) is Eccleſ.
 moſt ancient: according hereto we find that Hierarea
 (m) Clemens, (n) Dionyſius (both which li- cap. de
 ued in the Apoſtles dayes) as alſo Cyrill (o), Baptiſ.
 Cyprian (p), Ambroſe (q), Auſtin (r) &c. o) Caſe.
 do make frequent mention of holy water. ch. 3.

Cyprians words in the place cited are (p) L. 2.
 theſe: *Oportet mundari & ſanctificari prius a Ep. 12.
 quas à Sacerdote.* The lawfullnes of Bleſſing of (q) Lib.
 Creatures is warranted by the Example of 4. de Sa-
 Chriſt, who intending to multiply the (r) L. 6.
 Bread, did looke vp towards Heauen, and in Iulia-
 (s) Bleſſed the loaves. Now that the Church num.
 hath authority to bleſſe Creatures to ſpiri- (s) Luc.
 tuall ends (and this for the furthering of,
 deuo-

deuotion) is proued from her greater authority, practised in changing *the Sabbath day*; and now being changed is inalterable: One chiefe end of blessing of Creatures, is to signify spirituall Effects: Thus sprinkling of Ashes signifieth *Penance*, *Palmes* signify *Victory* &c.

Animaduerſion LXXXV.

There is a great disparity betweene vrging Protestants against themselves, and against the fayth by them then maintained, (which in this small Treatise is in seuerall places shewed) and by vrging such, as were reputed sometimes Catholikes, speaking and writing against any point of the Catholike Religion; seeing it is euident, that all such testimonies of this second kind, are not the impartiall conuincing Cōfession of the learned Aduersary against himself, but the vnequall Assertions of the parties themselves, in behalfe of their later conceaued Innouations, for the tyme by them held, though (in diuers of them) after retracted, by their finall submitting of themselves, and their writings to the Catholike Church. This *Animaduerſion* I giue with reference to the writings of these men following; *Laurētius Valla*, *Erasmus*, *Cassander*, *Cornelius Agrippa*, *Polidore Virgill*, *Nilas*, *Aeneas Silvius*, and some others, of which diuers of them finally retracted their former receaued Nouelismes, and reincorporated

rated themselves (before their death) into the Catholike Church. This *Animaduerſion* (though aboue intimated) I thought good to ſet downe, in that it is obſerued, that *Doctour Morton* in his *Apologia Catholica*, doth chiefly, and maynely rely vpon vrging the impertinent and defectiue testimonies of the foreſaid men (and ſome others, ſuch like, for breuity here omitted) for the impugning of our Catholike fayth and Religion.

Animaduerſion LXXXVI.

S Triue to be more conuerſant and ready (if oportunitie will not ſuffer you to be ready in all) in ſuch Controuerſies, which conſiſt in practice; as about *Praying to Saints*, *Judulgences*, *worſhipping of Images*, *Adoration of the moſt B. Sacrament*, *Communion vnder one kind* &c. then in others, which reſt only in beliefe and Speculation; ſeeing the vulgar Proteſtant ſooneſt taketh exception againſt theſe former, and will expect greater ſatisfaction from you in them; Becauſe theſe being ſubiect to their ſenſe (in regard of the daily praſtiſe of them) come neceſſe within the compaſſe of their narrow Capacity, & are by them often charged (through the calumny of their chiefe Maſters, abuſing their Credulity) with many ſuppoſed abuſes; Whereas other points of Fayth, which conſiſt chiefly in *Theory* and ſpeculation, are

K further

further remoued from their apprehensib^{le} and consequently they are least intrangled with the doubts thereof.

Animaduerſion LXXXVII.

Touching those Articles, or Controuersies, which chiefly rest in speculation, be well trauelled in the Question touching the *Infallibility of Gods Church*, as also in that other Question, *That the Scriptures (without the Churches attestation) cannot proue it selfe to be Scripture. and that all points of beliefe do not reccaine their prooffe from Scripture alone*: seeing these two Controuerties potentially include most of all other Controuerties within themselves. Also be most ready in the Question touching the *continua^l Visib^lity of the Protestant Church*, seeing the Protestants must seeke to proue their Church euer to haue beene Visible, if they willauer it to be the true Church of Christ. Whereas indeed you shall find euen by the Confession of his owne Brethren (as is told where in this Treatise made cleere) that the Protestant is not able to instance for many Centuries and Ages together, so much as the being but of one Protestant.

Animaduerſion LXXXVIII.

THere is scarcely any one Argument of *Credibility*, which more strongly and impliably proueth the Antiquity (and thereby

the truth) of the Roman Religion, and the
 Nouelty and latenes of Protestancy (and
 consequently the falshood therof) then this
 following. There cannot be alledged any
 one Protestant, (speaking of such Prote-
 stants, as are out of Controuersy, and ac-
 knowledged for such, both by the Catho-
 likes and Protestants) who was not either
 in himself, or in his forefathers, first a Ca-
 tholike, and who by dogmatizing some
 Protestant Opinions, afore neuer generally
 taught, did separate himself, & depart from
 the Catholike Church, afore then *in Being*;
 Of which sort of men those words in *S. Iohn*
 are vnderstood: *Exierunt* (t) *ex nobis*, the ve- (t) r.
 ry stampe or signature of Innotatours in *Iohn. 8.*
 doctrine. This Assertion is most true. And
 to exemplify it in the chiefest Protestants,
 or maintayners but of some points of Pro-
 testancy, I meane, *Luther, Sminglius, Ochinus,*
Jerome of Prage, Waldo, Wicleffe, Albigenfes, Be-
negarius; and to rise to the Heretikes of hi-
 gher tymes, as *Aerius, Ioninian, Manicheus,*
 and the rest; it is certaine that all these w. re
 Originally Catholikes, and by introducing
 of some Nouelismes, did depart from the
 Catholike Church. That all these (and all
 such others, as might be alledged) were ori-
 ginally Catholikes, is demonstratiuely pro-
 ued from the implicate Confessions of the
 learned Protestants themselves, acknowled-
 ging the *Inuisibility* of their owne Church
 for so many ages together. Thus for exam-

- ple writeth *Sebastianus Francus*, the Protestant (as above is shewed:) For (u) certain through the workes of Antichrist, the external Church together with the sayth and Sacraments, vanished away presently after the Apostles departure; and that for these fowreteene hundred years, the Church (he meaning his owne Protestant Church) hath not bene external and visible; with whom agreeth *D. Faikes*, saying: The (x) Church decayed immediately after the Apostles dayes. Furthermore to enlarge my selfe in the Protestants Confession herein, *M. Perkins* (the Protestant) sayth thus: Before (1) the dayes of Luther, for the space of many hundred yeares, an universall Apostasy overspread the whole face of the earth and that our Church was not then visible to the world. *M. Napper* in like manner thus writeth: God (2) hath witheraway his visible Church from open assemblies to the hearts of particular godly men &c. during the space of twen hundred & sixty yeares; the true Church abiding (at that time) invisible. But *M. Brocard* conveileth further in these words: During (3) even the second and third age (meaning after Christ) the true Church of God, and light of the Gospel was obscured by the Roman Antichrist himselfe. I will here conclude with *D. Downam*, thus averring: The (4) Generall defection of the Visible Church (foretold 2. Thessal. 2.) began to vpon the workes in the Apostles tymes. So luxuriant are the Protestants in confessing the Invisibility of their owne Church for many ages together.
- (u) In
Ep. de a-
brogenda
in v-
niuersum
omnibus
Status.
Eccles.
(x) Faikes
in his
answers
to a Con-
troversie
Cathol. p.
41.
(1) Per-
kins in
his Ex-
position
of the
Creed. p.
400.
(2) Nap-
per v-
pon Re-
uel in c.
21. & 12.
l. 3. c. 1. p.
25.
(3) Broc-
ard vpon
Reuel. p.
110.
(4) D.

gether. So as we see, that by the Confession *Down*
of these learned Protestants, it is cleere, that *lib. de*
all the former alledged Protestants, or any *Anti-*
others, which could be (though falsely) *christ.*
suggested for such, were Originall Catho-
likes. Now I hence conclude, that if on the
one syde it be proued, that euery Protestant
did Originally come out, and départe (by
venting of some Protestanticall Positions)
from our Catholike Church, afore enioying
a Priority of Being; and that on the other-
syde, our Aduersaries cannot shew any vi-
sible Society of men, professing the true
Christian sayth, from which, as more an-
cient, the present Roman Religion depar-
ted (as it is impossible for them to do :) I
say, I hence conclude; that our Catholike
sayth is most ancient (and therefore true)
and Protestancy (in respect thereof) but
late Innouations, and therefore false.

Animaduersion LXXXIX.

I Will here rest in some *Animaduersions* tou-
ching the Doctrine of the *Real Presence*:
And touching the saluing of the difficulties
thereof, we are to recur to *Gods Power*, which
may in part be explicated in these ensuing
Propositions.

The first Proposition. *God is able to do ene-*
ry thing, which Mans vnderstanding is able to
conceiue. The Reason hereof being, in that
Ens & Verum in generall are the *Objects* of
our mind; and therefore what may be con-

ceaued or vnderstood, may really exist, and consequently be performed.

The second proposition. *All Christian Philosophers affirme, that not only things, which mans able to apprehend in his mind, but also many other things incomprehensib'e in mans vnderstanding, God can effect: for seing (say they) that Totum Ens is Intelligible, and to be conceaued, and that which is not Ens, cannot be conceaued, and that the imbecility of Mans vnderstanding is such, that it supposeth many things cannot exist or be (and consequently cannot be apprehended by the vnderstanding) which may indeed exist, and so may be performed by God: Therefore say they, that things incomprehensible in Mans Vnderstanding, God can effect.*

The 3. proposition. *God hath in All things, as much an Active power, by how much they haue in themselves a passive power: And which is more, we Christians do helieue, that the Active power of God can extend beyond the Passive power of things; and agreeably hereto we helieue, that God created the world of Nothing: Now to make a thing of Nothing, is not to depend or rely of the Passive power of the Subiect; seeing in this kind of producing there was no preexistent Subiect at all, much lesse any Passive power thereof.*

The fourth. *Every thing is possible to God to be done, which implyeth not a Contradiction. Now what implyeth a Contradiction, is impossible to be done; Because what implyeth*

plyeth a *Contradiction*, supposeth a *Being*, and a *Nothing* of a thing; and all this at one tyme, and in one manner of circumstance: And therefore if such a thing could be, then could a thing be, whose being (a thing most absurd) should consist in a *Not being*.

The fifth. It riseth partly from out the former propositions, that what faculty, or Operation God doth impart to any thing created, the same he also eminenter (as the Schoolmen speak) retaineth to himself, and is able to performe it, without the help of any Secondary cause, This must be assumed as true in force of Reason, since otherwise, the Creature should transcend in might the Creatour; which *Axiome* being applyed to diuers difficulties in the Question of the *Eucharist*, demonstrateth that God can preserve an *Accident* without its *Subiect*, and that he can keepe a Body without any circumscription of *Place*, since otherwise it would follow, that in these Examples, A *Subiect* and *Place*, should be able to performe more, then God could performe; which were great blasphemy to maintayne.

Animaduerſion LXXXX.

THE Philosophers do assigne threethings to concur to *Magnitude*. The first of these is, that every *Magnitude* should haue an extension in it selfe, and haue *Partem ex-*

tra partem; That is, that one part should not be confounded in it selfe with another part, and consequently an *intrinsicall* sitē, & disposition of parts. And this is of the very essence of Euery *Magnitude*, and cannot be separated from it.

The Second thing, agreeing to euery *Magnitude*, is to haue a commensuration & coextension with *Place*, that is, an intrinsicall disposition, and order of parts according to place. This second ariseth from the first; and consequently as being later in Nature then the first, may by Gods power be separated from the same; yea it is actually separated from the first in the *highest Sphere*, the parts whereof are in no place.

The third, and last property of *Magnitude* is, to extrude and driue away all other *Magnitudes* from that place, which is made equall and commensurable to it selfe; that is, not to suffer another *Magnitude* to be in the same place with it. Now, as the second was later then the first, so this third resulteth out of the second, and is later then the same in Nature, and therefore may be separated from it. Now according to this doctrine, we Catholiks hold, that *Christs Body* in the Sacrament hath the true and whole *Magnitude* of his Body; But this *Magnitude* hath there only the first Condition, which is essentiall to euery *Magnitude* (to wit, to be extended in it selfe, and by reason of that intrinsicall extension, to haue *partem extra partem*)

partem (but it hath not the second Condition of Magnitude (much leſſe the third,) for it is not coextended with any place, but exiſteth whole (in reſpect of all externall place) in every part.

Animaduerſion LXXXI.

THE two ſupreme Myſteries of the Trinity, and the Incarnation, do afford a ſtrong Argument, that a Body may at once be in ſeueral places (and conſequently Chriſts Body). Thus I diſpute: In the Trinity we find an *Vnity*, or (as I may terme it) an *Indiuiduality* of Nature, and a *Diverſity* of perſons, ſortable to the *Vnity* of a Body, and multiplicity of places. Now here every one of theſe three *Perſons* is identified really & formally with this *Nature*, whereas the Body is only externally conioyned with the Place. Now touching the Incarnation, we are taught, that one *Hypoſtaſis*, or *Perſon* is in two *Natures*; which two *Natures* are far more different in themſelues, then ſeueral Places can be. Again the *Vnion* here betwene the *Perſon* and the *Nature* is far greater (as being intrinſicall and ſubſtantiall) then the *Vnion* of the Body and the Place can be, which is only accidentary and extrinſicall; and which is more (a circumſtance wanting in the *Vnion* of the Body, & Place,) here the *Perſon* or *Hypoſtaſis* is identified, and made the ſame Really, and formally, with its *Divine Nature*. Here then to recapitulate

tulate, Yf in the *Trinity* one *Nature* be in three seuerall persons, without any confusion of the *Persons*, or distraction of the *Nature*. And if in the *Incarnation* one *Hypostasis*, or *Person* be in two different *Natures*, and yet neither the *Natures* confounded, nor the *Hypostasis* distracted or multiplied: much more easely then may *Christs* Body by diuine power be in seuerall places at one and the same tyme.

Animaduerſion LXXXII.

THe like Argument to the former we may draw from *Gods Ubiquity*. *God* being heere, and an indiuisible thing, is in all places and things whatſoeuer, (for if he were not ſo, then would it follow, that *God* ſhould be circumscribable, and conſequently not infinite.) It cannot be here answered, that he replenisheth all places, as one; ſince we muſt grant, that he is able to create another world, far remote from this, and ſo ſhould be preſent in the ſame world, and conſequently in ſeuerall and far diſtant places. Neither is this doubt ſalued by ſaying, that *God* is only a ſpiritual Subſtance, and not a Body; ſince this point aduantageeth nothing: for the mayne reaſon, why it ſhould ſeeme, that a Body cannot be in diuers places, is not taken ſo much, *a mole corporis, quam ab unitate corporis*, which *Unity*, as it is more perfect in *God*, then it can be in a Body ſo it ſhould ſeeme, it ſhould be no leſſe di-

ded and distracted in it selfe in God, then
a Body, through his being in diuersity of
Places.

Animaduerſion LXXXIII.

O these two former Arguments (in
proofe that a Body may be in two places) I
will adioyne this following taken from the
Nature of Eternity. It is this : *Eternity* is de-
scribed to be, *Instant durationis, non fluxus*, that
is, *an Instant of Duration, which is euer present,*
and neuer passeth away. Now the difficulty
(and such, which in the like touch of the
doubt is greater, then the former confessed
difficulty of a Body being in seuerall places
at once) consisteth in this, To wit, That this
Instant of Duration, being but one *Instant*,
yet is, and coexisteth in seuerall tymes, both
past and to *Come* : and yet neither is this *In-*
stant devided, or multiplied, nor these se-
uerall *Tymes* confounded. And heere a cir-
cumstance, much aggrauating the difficulty
is, that diuers *Places*, wherein we may sup-
pose a body to be, do still remayne at one
tyme, though far remote one from another;
whereas these *Precedent*, and *future tymes* (in
both which one and the same *Instant of Du-*
ration, or *Eternity* is) are euer in a flowing
and departing Motion, and consequently
cannot by any possibility remayne toge-
ther. For we see, that the tyme past doth euer
give place to the tyme to come. Thus far of
these former *Animaduerſions* in this place, to
shew,

shew, that it is possible, that *Christ* may be in severall places, at one, and the same tyme.

Animadversion LXXXIX.

(y) Luther lib.
Contra
Ana-
baptist.

IN all Positive and Affirmative Points of fayth, the Protestants do agree with the Catholiks; the Protestants borrowing the said Affirmative points from the Church of Rome. According hereto we find Luther thus to wryte: *We (y) confesse, that there is under the Papacy most of the Christian Good, rather all the Christian Good, and that from thence it came to us. We confesse, that there is in the Papacy true Scripture, true Baptisme, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true keyes to the remission of sinnes, the true office of preaching, true Catechisme &c. I say further there is in the Papacy true Christianity, or rather the true kernell of Christianity. Thus Luther.*

To the former position I adioyne this following: In such points of fayth, wherein Protestancy dissenteth from the Roman Church, all the said points are merrely Negations to the contrary Affirmative Articles, believed by the Church of Rome. As for example, Deniall of *Real Presence*, Deniall of *praying to Saints*, Deniall of *Free will*, and so of the rest. Now from these two propositions do result these Inferences or Conclusions following: The first, that the Protestant, as he belieueth any affirmative Articles with the Church of Rome, in that respect he is not

is Protestant, but rather a Catholike, as
taking the beliefe of them from the Ca-
tholike Church, as is aboue said. The se-
cond Inference: That Protestancy (as Pro-
testancy) consisteth in Deniall of such Affir-
mative points, which the Church of Rome
firmes to be true; and not in belieuing
with the said Church, certaine chiefe points
of Christianity. The third Inference; Seeing
the reduplicative formality of Protestancy re-
sisteth in Negations, or primations of an Affir-
mative sayth; and seing Negations or prima-
tions haue no Entity, subsistence, or reall be-
ing; that therfore, Protestancy (as Pro-
testancy) hath no reality of Being, but is in it
selfe a meere Non-entity, or nothing; & con-
sequently it followeth, that Protestancy
cannot proceed from God, who is the Au-
thour of things, and of that which is, but
not of that which is not, or is Nothing. The
last Inference shalbe; That Protestants by
their Deniall of so many Affirmative Arti-
cles of Christianity, may seeme to beare
great Reference to Antichrist; who at his
coming shall by his Deniall of all points
of Christian Religion, seeke (what in him
lyeth) to annihilate, and ouerthrow all
Christian Religion; And for such his pro-
ceeding some ancient Fathers do cōiecture,
that his name shalbe ἀντίχριστος, signifying
Nego; as Hyppolitus Martyr writeth in Ora-
tione de consummatione mundi. And this both
by reason that this Greeke Word maketh

vp the number, to wit, 666. which is ascribed peculiarly to *Antichrist* in the Apocalypse cap. 13. as also in that *Antichrist*, & his Ministers at his coming both in their *Doctrines* and workes, shall labour mightely to ouerthrow Christian Religion.

Animaduersion LXXXV.

THough Protestancy seeme to maintaine some *Affirmative* Positions, as Parity of Ministers, Marriage of Priests, and other Votaries, Reprobation, Christs only Mediatorship by way of Intercession, Christ suffering in Soules yet it is euident, that these positions are only *Affirmative* in words, but merely *Negative* in sense; since they are *Negatives* to the Monarchy of the Churches Government, to vowed Chastity, to vniuersality of Grace, to the Intercession of Saints, and to the all sufficiency of Christs Corporall Death: All which our Catholike points are *Affirmative*: Such is the subtilty of Innouation in Doctrine as (for the greater honour) to inuest their *Negative* Tenets, in *Affirmative* Titles.

Animaduersion LXXXVI.

THough in shew of words, *Falshood* (as is aboue shewed) may be deliuered in *Affirmatives*; so I here say, that *Truth* sometimes is deliuered in *Negative* Words, notwithstanding *Truth* is euer *Affirmative*, and *Falshood* *Negative*; and therefore the Schoolemen truly teach: *Intellektus (2) decipitur non circa*

(2) S.
Thomas
part. 1.
q. 17.

Quid est, sed circa, quid non est. To exemplify this *Animadversion*: To say, *God is cruel*, or *Man is blind*, though these sayings be denoted in *Affirmative* termes, and false; yet they are in sense and vnderstanding meerely *Negative*, since *Cruelty* is exclusive to *Mercy*, and *blindnes* to *sight*: so on the contrary to say; *God is not Cruel*, and *Man is not blind*, though they be in termes *Negative*, & true; yet they are in sense *Affirmative*, only as denying the Negation of *Mercy* in *God*, and of *Blindnes* in *Man*.

Animadversion LXXXXVII.

O V^r Aduersaries cannot agree among themselves, what Doctrines be *Protestancy*, and who ought to be truly termed *Protestants*: Can their Religion then be true, and descend from Heauen?

Here then I will first shew, within what narrow Limits our Aduersaries do confine *Protestancy*, and the members of the *Protestant Church*: Next then I will discover, (such is the fluctuating and wauering iudgment of them herein) how they are content at other times, to extend and enlarge those bounds, by affording *Protestancy* and the members thereof, a greater space or compasse (as I may say) to expatiate and walke in.

And to begin. D. Whitaker thus sayth of ^{(a) L. 2.} *contra* the *Papists*: I will (a) not allow the very name *Duranda* of a lawfull Church vnto the *Roman Church*, be- ^{S. 2. 1.} cause

(b) Cap.

9.

(c) Cap.

20.

(d) Art.

1.

(e) In

his first

Books of

the

Church.

c. 1.

(f) In his

way to

the

Church.

pag. 10.

(g) Of

the suc-

cession of

the

Church.

(h) Con-

trouers.

2. q. 3.

cap. 9.

cause it hath nothing, which a true Church ought to have. The Confession of *Ausburg* concludes the *Anabaptists* in these words; We (b) *condemne* the *Anabaptists*, who disallow the Baptisme of Infants, and thinke them to be saved without Baptisme; to which sentence the Confession of *Switzerland* (c) subscribeth. The *Arians* are excluded from being Protestants by the foresaid Confession of *Ausburg* in these termes: We (d) *condemne* all Heresies rising against this Article (meaning the Article of the Trinity,) as the *Manichees*, *Arians*, *Eutychians* &c. All Heretikes are excluded out of the number of Protestants; for thus D. *Saunders* teacheth: Heretikes (e) are not of the Church; meaning of the true Church, (and consequently in his iudgment, of the Protestant Church.) With whom agrees D. *White* saying: All (f) Heretiks teach the truth in some things, yet we deny them to be of the Church of God. That *Schismatiks* are not of the Protestant Church, is taught, for thus writeth D. *Fulke*: (g) What skilleth it, whether one, being drawne by Heresy, or Schisme from the body of Christ, be subject to eternall Damnation? And D. *Whitaker* thus answereth: It (h) is false, that Hereticall and Schismaticall Churches are true Churches. Thus far of our Aduersaries excluding Papists, *Anabaptists*, *Arians*, Heretiks, and *Schismatiks* from the Protestant Church, and not acknowledging them to be members thereof, nor their Doctrines, Protestancy. Now we will obserue, what change

chan
our
will
of
Pro
first
Pop
of C
M. I
Rom
Bau
Pap
adm
pad
thin
fed
in
ter
ged
of v
his
Ar
An
sam
ref
fin
of
be
wr
the
it
(p)

change and mutability of iudgment herein
 our Aduersaries shew at other tymes, in
 willingly embracing all these former sort
 of men (and some others also) as good
 Protestants, and in state of Saluation. And
 first of the Papists, Luther sayth : In (i) the
 Popery there is true Christianity. yea the Kernall
 of Christianity, & many pious & great Saints.
 M. Hooker: (k) We gladly acknowledg them of
 Rome, to be of the family of Iesus Christ: and M.
 Bunney: We (l) are no severall Church from the
 Papists, nor they from vs. The Anabaptists are
 admitted for good Protestants by Occolam-
 padius; saying: (m) Baptisme is an externall
 thing, which by Law of Charity may be dispen-
 sed with. And D. (n) Morton: We Protestants
 iudge the state of the Anabaptists, not to be ut-
 terly desperate. The Arians are acknowl-
 edged by M. Morton, to be of the same Church
 of which the Protestants are, and he giueth
 his reason in these words: Because (o) the
 Arians hold the foundation of the Gospell.
 And M. Hooker seemeth to intimate the
 same in these words: The p) Arians in the
 reformed Churches of Poland &c. hereby in-
 sinuating, that those Protestant Churches
 of Poland did acknowledg the Arians, to
 be members of their Church.

Of Idolaters, M. Hooker thus fauorably
 writeth: Christians (q) by externall profession
 they are all, whose marks of recognizance hath in
 it those things, which we haue mentioned yea al-

L

though

(p) Beiles. Pol. lib. 4 p. 181. (q) Eccles. Fol. l. 3 pag. 110.

(i) In

Ep. com.

tra A-

nabapt.

(k) L.

Eccles.

Pol. 3. c.

118.

(l) In his

Treatise

of pacifi-

cation,

sect. 13.

(m) L. 2.

Ep. p. 61.

(n) In his

answer

to the

Protest.

Apol. 1.

4 cap. 1.

sect. 10.

(o) In

his booke

of the

kingdom

of Israel,

and the

Church.

bag. 94.

though they be impious Idolaters, wicked Hereticks &c. Infidells are also in our Aduersaries iudgments, members of a sauing Church, sayth: for thus writeth Swings: *Ethnic*

(r) *Swin.* (r. si piam mentem domi fouerit, Christianam
gl. Ep & etiam si hristum ignoret. And hereupon Sw
Otolam. glus concludeth, that: s) Hercules, Socrates, A
l. a. p. 10 rissides are now in Heauen, as is in another
(s) *Swin.* place shewed. Finally the Protestants are
gl. som. courteous, as that they are content to in
a. fol. 118. corporate Antichrist within their Church
& 339. state of Saluation. This I thus proue; first
ouermuch knowne and diuulged, that ma
ny Protestants do teach with full mouth
that the Pope is Antichrist; Now then let
see, how at other times they write of him,
u hom they hould to be Antichrist. and his
Religion Antichristianity. Here then we find
D. Whitaker thus to acknowledg: I will (u)
not say, that from the tyme, that Papistrie began
to be Antichristianity, the Popes themselves
haue bene all damned. And yet D. Whitaker
where confidently auerreth the Pope to be
Antichrist. In like sort, M. Powell hath the
like sentence, saying: I will (u, in no wise say
that all the Popes from the tyme, that papistrie
was first reuealed to be Antichristianity, are
damned. Thus much of this point; whereby
we may discerne the wondrousfull and vn
heard mutability of our Aduersaries iudg
ments, touching who are Protestants, and
Professours of that Church, wherein a man
may be saued, A demonstration vnanswe
rable

(1) D.
Whita.
in his
answere
to the
first De-
monstra-
tion of
D. dam-
ders.
(u) In
his ans-
were to
the last
Demon-
stration
of D.
Sanders.

le and irrepliable to proue, that the Protestant Church and sayth, such as these former men do restrayne, or enlarge it, is capable of Saluation. And how then can Christian know, if he will reiy vpon the arguments of Protestants herein, to what of Protestants, or within what Church he may range himself, for the Saluation of Soule?

Imaduerfion LXXXVIII.

N that there are many Catholike Articles, the which the *Iewes* before the coming of Christ did belieue; therefore it followeth evidently, that the said Articles cannot be reputed to be Innouations, or lately inuented Doctrines, but as ancient as the times before our Sauours Incarnation: I will exemplify in some. The Booke Ecclesiasticus, admit for the tyme it be not Scripture, speaketh directly of our Sauours ascending into Hell in those words, where it is said in his person: *I (x) will pierce through (x) the four parts of the Earth; I will looke vpon all flesh, as hee as be a sleepe, and will lighten all them, that are in the Lord: A saying so pertinent for proofe of Limbus Patrum, that D. Whitaker* (v) *Con-*
tra Bn-
yaum. l.
8 pag.
307.
) acknowledging the true sense thereof, saydeth it, by saying the Booke is not Canonically; which at this present is impertinent, since here I seeke only to proue the truth of diuers of our Catholike points, as being believed by the Ancient *Iewes*, be-

fore our Saviours tyme, in their writings; whether Canonically, or not Canonically.

Touching *Prayer for the Dead*, It is warranted by the example of *Indas* (2) *Machabees*, the true servant of God; as also is taught by *Rabbi Simeon* (who lived before *Christ*) and diuers other ancient Rabbyes; *Rabbi Simeon* thus writing of such, as are temporally punished after this life: After (a) they are purged from the filth of their sinnes, then doth God cause them to ascend out of that place.

Touching Gods Induration, or hardning of *Pharaos* hart, the *Iewish Rabins* so conspire in affirming with vs, the same to be by Gods permission only, and not by his working, that *Peter* (b) *Martyr*, and *Mansler* (c) do accordingly acknowledg this Exposition.

Concerning *Freewill*, that place in *Ecclesiasticus*, (d) to wit: Say not thou, he hath caused me to erre; Yf thou wilt, thou shalt observe the Commandements: He hath set water and fire before thee, stretch out thy hand to which thou wilt: Before man is life and death, Good & Evil; what lyketh him, shalbe given him. This testimony (I say) is so euident for *Freewill*, that *D. Whitaker* in answer thereto reiecteth the authority, saying: *De loco* (e) *Ecclesiastici parum labore &c.* makes small account of *Ecclesiasticus*. *Philo* the learned Iew, who lived in *Christ* his tyme, thus writeth: Man (f) hath *Freewill*, to which purpose is extant the Oracle in *Deuteronomy*: I have placed before thee *Life*

(2) *Machab.* 1.

(a) In *lib. Zoar.*

in cap

13. *Genes.*

(b) *Peter Martyr.*

in *Epist.*

ad *Roman.* c. 9.

(c) *Mansler* in *Annot.*

in *Exod.* c. 7.

(d) *Ecclesiast.* 15.

(e) In *resp. ad*

rat.

Camp.

rat. 1 p.

13.

(f) *Philo* in *lib.*

quod Deus sit immutabilis.

and Death, Good and Evil; chuse Lyfe.

Concerning *Angells & Saints*, the Booke of *Tobias*, written before *Christ*, is so playne (g) with vs, touching *Patronage and interces.* (g) *Tob.* son of *Angells*, that therefore *D. Whitaker* doth accordingly confesse and say thereof: *Ilum* (h) *verò l'obie Raphaellem &c.* Little do we re- (h) *Whi-* gard the Example of *Raphaell* the *Angell*, men- *sak. in* tioned in *Toby &c.* All this is different from the *respons.* *ad rat.* *Camp.* *rat. i. pa* *15.* *(i) Tob.* *14.* *(k) Ec-* *cles. 1.* *(l) Orig.* *hom. 5. in* *Numer.* *Psal. 2.* *(m) Wri-* *ting v-* *pon the* *Books in* *Capitulis* *patrum.* *(n) lo-* *seph. ant.* *etiquita-* *um lu-* *daicarum* *l. 13. c. 21*

Concerning the force of *Merit of Almes*, and other good works, proceeding from true sayth in the *Messias*; The Doctrine of the *Ancient Iewes* is deliuered in the Booke of *Tobys Almes* (i) doth deliuer from Death, and doth purge all sinne; and in the foresaid booke of *Ecclesiasticks*: As water (k) quencheth burn- ing fier, So *Almes* expieth sinne.

Touching *vnwritten Traditions*, (l) *Ori-* *gen* and *Hilary* do affirme, that *Moyfes* did leaue many things vnwritten, the know- ledge whereof was continued by tradition: (m) *Wri-* *And Rabby Iudas* affirmeth the same of *Moy-* *ses*: a thing so eident, that the doctrine of the *Tradition* of the *Iewes* is confessed by (m) *Paulus Phagins* the Protestant.

That *Monasticall Lyfe* was not altogether wanting, but in some sort professed among the ancient *Iewes*, is witnessed by *Iosephus*, thus writing: The (n) *righteousnes* of the *Esf-* *raites* is *mermaylous &c.* They enioy their riches in Common &c. And in this course aboue foure thousand mendolins, hauing neither wyfes nor

(o) *Isa. servants &c.* And in another place: *Triall* (o) *Isa. 1. de is had of a mans continency; and his other man- bello lu- ners are for two yeares tryed, and then he is taken daito. 1. into the Company.*

cap. 7. Lastiy, to omit (for greater breuity) the (p) *Gala. Doctrine of Vowes*, the doctrine of one Vi- in aca- sible high Priest, head of the Church in those nis Ca- Jewish tymes; the Doctrin of the *lewes* in shol. ve- remitting the ending of Controuersies, not to ritatis. 1. the Scripture, but to a certaine visible and li- 10 v. 3. mely Judge; the doctrine of the *lewes* con- (q) *Phi- cerning Confession of sinne*, all these being nics in cap. 18. related by (p) *Galatinus*; I will close this Num. passage with *Melchisedech* his offering of (r) *Ha- bread and Wyne* in sacrifice, and the prefigu- sardan, in Beres- ration thereby of our Sacrifice of the New chis sayth: In (q) the tyme of the *Messias*, all Sacri- Rabbi, ad fice shall cease, but the Sacrifice of bread and cap. 14. Wyne shall not cease, &c. as it is said Psalm: Gen. 100. *Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the (s) Sa- Order of Melchisedech.* Rabbi (r) *Hasardan, & muel in Rabbi (s) Samuel* say the like of *Melchisedech* Bereschis his offering vp of bread and wyne, in figure Rabbi ad of the Sacrifice now in the tyme of the New cap. 14. Testament; a point so euident, that (t) *Bi- Genes. bliander*, the remarkable Protestant, doth (t) *Bi- not doubt to confesse the same of the old bliander. Jewish Rabins.* Thus far of the doctrines of de 33. the ancient *lewes* before *Christ* his Incarna- Trinita- tion: which doctrines we Catholiks at this te 1. 2. day hold. All which doctrines are meere- p. 28. 39. Dogmaticall points, without any Type or re- ference

ference to Christ his comming, that only of Melchisedech excepted, and therefore it cannot be answered, that the said doctrines should now cease vpon our Saviours comming in flesh into the world, as some ignorant men would suggest; but it must needs be that the said Doctrines, if they were true then, they must be also true now. By which so many foresaid Examples of our Catholike sayth, thus affirmed by the ancient lawes, it is made most certaine, that our Religion is not New, or lately inuented, but most ancient and vndoubtedly Apostolike:

Animaduerfion LXXXIX.

[T]is a most impudent assertion of D. Field, who thus writeth: We (*) firmly beliene, (**) Dr. that all the Churches of the world, wherein our Fathers lived and dyed, to haue bene the true Protestant Churches of God &c. and that they, which taught, embraced, and beliened those damnable Errors, which the Romanists do defend against vs, were only a faction. But see how this most vast Lye is controuled. First then D. Iewell thus acknowledgeth: The (u) Truth was unknowne at that tyme, and unheard of, when Martin Luther, and Hilderick Swinplius first came vnto the knowledg, and preaching of the Gospel; And therefore (x) Burtor stileth Luther: The first Apostle to vs of the reformed Doctrine. And Schlusfelburg, the great Protestant, thus contesteth the same:

L 4

Jt 10. ed

Epist. Hereford.

his book
Church. l.
3. c. 8. p.
76.
(u) Iewel
in his
Apolo-
gy of the
Church:
part. 4. c.
4.
(x) Burtor
in
Ep. anno

(y) In
Theolog.
Calu. L. 2.
fol. 130.
(z) Lu-
ther Ep.
ad Ar-
genti-
nens.

*It (y) is impudency to affirme, that many lea-
ned men in Germany before Luther, did holde the
Doctrine of the Gospell. Yea Luther himselfe
thus vaunteth of himselfe: Christum (z) & m.
bis, primò vulgatum, audemus gloriari. And
truly the force of reason assureth vs, that
there were no Protestants at, or immediately
before the breaking out of Luther. For if
any were, why did they lye hid, and va-
knowne at Luthers Rising? No other pre-
text can be alledged, but feare of persecu-
tion; But this cannot be alledged; For the
Protestants (if any then were) might secu-
rely step out, and ioynе themselves with
Luther; considering that then diuers Magi-
strats and Commonwealths had openly va-
dertaken the Patronage of Luthers Do-
ctrine, and Religion.*

Animaduerſion C.

IN all points of faith the Authority of the
Primate Spirit is to be contemned, as beget-
ting nothing but Noueltyes, and Innoua-
tion; And let ech good Catholike anſwer
his iudgement vpon the authority of *Chriſts*
viſible Church, and the chiefe Head thereof,
aſſuring himſelfe, that although *Simon the*
fiſher was not able to determine Matters of
faith; yet that *Simon Peter*, and his Succeſ-
ſours (aſſiſted with competency of meanes)
haue euer an impeacheable Soueraignty
granted to them, and a delegated authority
from *Chriſt* himſelfe, for the abſolute diſ-
cuſſing

ussing and deciding of all Controuersyes
 in Religion : *Tu (a) es Petrus, & super hanc (a) Matb.*
Petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam, & porta In-164
fermon prenal abunt aduersus eum. And truly
 if the visible Church of Christ, and the Su-
 preme Iudge therof could err in matter of
 fayth; how could God be excused from
 Cruelty, by threatning to all Men eternall
 Perdition, if we be not obedient to the
 Church of God? *Die (b) Ecclesia, & si Eccle- (b) Math*
fiam non audierit, sit sicut Ethnicus & Publi-18.
canus. Furthermore as the Apostle saith :
 (*) *Our Testament is established in better Pro-*
misses &c. meaning then the Testament of (*) *Hebr;*
 the Jewes : But if it was said In the tyme of 3.
 the Old Law, that he, who (c) presumptu- (c) *Deu-*
 ouly refuseth to obey the Commandemēt *teron. 17.*
 of the Pryest, that by Decree of the Iudge
 that man should dye; what punishment the
 is he to vndergoe, who in Matters of faith
 and Religion, contemneth the authority
 of the High Pryest of Christ his Church,
 aduancing his owne priuate iudgement a-
 boue the said Authority?

Animaduerfion CI.

[T is most certaine that *Luther* himself
 was not a perfect and entire Protestant
 (such I meane, as the present Church of
 England acknowledgeth for a true Prote-
 stant) my Reasons are these : First, because
Luther after his rising, and euer vnto his
 death, retayned and belieued diuers of our

Catholike Doctrines, disclaymed from by the Protestants of England. Secondly, because *Luther* taught and maintayned severall Heresies; I meane, *Heresies* euen in the iudgment of our now Protestants. To begin with the first branch: *Luther* euer maintayned to his death, *the Reall Presence*, as the whole world knoweth; and therefore his followers in this doctrine are called, for distinction sake, *Lutherans*, by *Swinglins* and *Calwin*.

(d) *Luther*. *L. de gelicall Conncells*; to wit, that a man may do more, then that he is commanded.

Affer-
sionibus
Art. 30.
(e) *Vr-*
banus
Regius
in 1 pars.
Operum
formulae
causæ lo-
quendi,
de sancti-
cultu.
(f) *Luther*, in
purgat.
quorum-
dam Ar-
ticulo-
rum, in
Epist. ad Gregorium. Spalat. (g) Beza, in resp. ad Colloq. Mont-
belg pars. altera, in bras (h) Crusellius in his refut. Caracomon-
ium missa, printed Magdeburg. 161. pag. 118.

Luther taught the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, of which point see *Tom. 1. Wittenberg de Indulgentijs*: And answerably to this ground he is contessed by (e) *Urbanus Regius*, a Protestant, to defend *Prayer for the Dead*.

Luther defended *Prayer to Saints*, of which point he thus writeth: *De (f) intercessionibus Dinorum, cum tota Ecclesia Christiana sentio, & iudico Sanctos à nobis honorandos esse, atque indicandos.*

Luther taught and approued the vse of *Images*, as is wicnelled by *Beza (g)*. Touching the making the signe of the *Crosse* vpon our forehead, *Iohannes Crenellius* a *Lutheran* thus writeth: *Cum (h) immensum, sine surgimus à Letto, cruce nos iuxta Lutheri, & aliorum piorum institutionem, signamus.*

Final
Epist. ad Gregorium. Spalat. (g) Beza, in resp. ad Colloq. Mont-
belg pars. altera, in bras (h) Crusellius in his refut. Caracomon-
ium missa, printed Magdeburg. 161. pag. 118.

Finally, to omit some other points, where *Luther* neuer dissented from the Church of Rome, *Luther* euer maintained, that the gouernment of the Church is *Monarchiall*, & neither *Aristocraticall*, nor *Popular*; as appeareth out of his owne (i) words.

Now to come to relate *Luthers* blasphe-
(and such as are reputed for Heresies, and some of them for blasphemies, both by Catholiks and Protestants, which he euer maintained without any after retraction) I first alledg his impious Doctrine touching the most Blessed Trinity, concerning which he thus speaketh: (k) *The Diuinity is threefold, as the three Persons be &c.* And according to this he expungeth out of the *Litany* this sentence: *Holy (l) Trinity, one very God, haue mercy vpon vs*; and he further sayth: *Anima (m) mea odit Hemonson, or Consubstantialis.* Briefly *Luthers* Blasphemy was so odious & execrable against the B. Trinity, that *Swinglius* (n) did purposely write against *Luther*, touching this very point.

Touching the Euent of things, *Luther* holdeth (contrary to all Christian sayth) that all things come to passe, through a certaine Stoicall and fatal Necessity, thus writing hereof: *Nullius (o) est in manu &c.* It is in no mans power to thinke Good or Evil; but all things (as *Wicleffs* Article condemned at Con-

stance *Wittenberg*. Latinè edit. anno 1558. (n) *Swinglius*, tom 2, in respons. ad *Confutas. Lutheri* (o) *Luther*. in *Ajst. damnat. per Leonem De-*
simum, 177. 30.

(i) *Vide Luther. in loc. Com. Class. 1. c. 3. 7. pag. 107.*

(k) *So relateth Swinglius of Luther so speaking. 10.*

1. ad respons. & *Confutas. Luther. fol. 474.*

(l) *Luth. in Enchir. pro. cum an. no 1543.*

(m) *Luth. contra Iacobum Latio. num. tom. 2.*

stance did rightly teach) proccede from absolute Necessity. Luther taught an Heresy, whereby the propagation of Christian Religion is much hindred; to wit, that it was not lawful to wage war against the Turk. His words are: *Prelari (p) contra Turcas, est repugnare Deo, visitanti iniquitates nostras per illos.*

(p) Lu.
sh. in

serm. 2.

Wis-

temberg.

& in

Affers.

Dammat

per Leo-

nem de-

cimum.

Affers.

34.

(q) Lu-

sher. de

seculari

poteſta-

te, in 10.

6. Germ.

(r) Lu-

sher. 10.

2 propos.

3.

(s) Lu-

sher in

his Ser-

mons

Engli-

shed, pag 176.

(t) These be D. Couells words in defence of M.

Hooker, Art. 35, p. 101. (u) In hist. Sacr. pars. 1. a. 1. fol. 14.

Luther denyed all temporall Magistrats, thus teaching hereof: Among (q) Christians no man can or ought to be a Magistrate; but every one is to another equally subject.

Touching sayth and good works, Luther thus endocrinateth his followers. *Fides (t) nisi sit sine Op'e.* Except sayth be without good works, it doth not iustify, nay it is not sayth. And further: No (s) works is disallowed by God, except the Author thereof be disallowed before.

Luther further taught, as D. Couell witnesseth, that (t) the Sacraments were effectually, though they were administered by Satan himself. Of which point Hespinius (the Protestant) thus also writeth: *Lutherus (u) consueque progreditur Op'e.* Luther proceedeth so far herein, that he maintaineth the Sacrament, to be a true Sacrament, etiam si a Diabolo conficeretur, though it were to be consecrated by the Devil.

To conclude, Luther so disallowed the sufficiency of Christ suffering in body for us, as that he most blasphemously teacheth, that Christ did not suffer only in body, but

also

also his Divinity suffered for vs: His words
 hereof are these: *Cum (x) credo, quod sola hu-* (x) *Lu-*
mana Natura pro me passa est, Christus vilis, ther in
nece magni pretij Saluator est &c. Yf I believe, Confess.
that only the humane Nature suffered for me, Maiore
then is Christ a Saviour but of a base & small in Cana
worth and himself needeth a Saviour. Thus far Dominus,
 now in Demonstration, that *Luther* was not
 an entyre Protestant, and such as is allowed
 by the present Church of England.

Animaduerſion CII.

TWO things, among others, concur (as
 is in this last *Animaduerſion* exemplified
 in *Luther*) to make a perfect Protestant; to
 wit, That he doth maintayne all chiefe points of
 Protestancy: Thus he is not to hould only
 some few points of Protestancy, and in the
 rest (being more in number, and of greater
 importance) to partake with the Catho-
 likes. The second thing necessary to a Pro-
 testant, that he doth not hould pertinacionſly
 any mayne Heresy or Paradoxe, wholly im-
 pugned and contradicted both by Catho-
 likes and Protestants; For this man in this
 respect is rather to be stiled an open Here-
 tike, then a Protestant, euen in the Censure
 of the Protestants themselves. Here now I
 auer, that this *Animaduerſion* clearly eu-
 ideth, that *Husse, Waldo, Wicliffe*, and the rest,
 so much vrged for Protestants for the prooffe
 of the visibility of the Protestant Church
 in those ages; were no Protestants at all, and
 [conſe-

consequently, that the Protestant Church cannot be said to be truly in them.

To begin with *John Hulse*, who lived anno 1400. The Articles, wherein *Hulse* and the *Bohemians* his followers, did believe, are related by *M. Fox* to be these following,

(y) *Ad. Mon. p. 280.* saying: The (y) only propositions were these foure Articles; The first, Communion vnder both kinds; The second, that all Ciuill Dominion was forbidden to the Clergy; The third, that the preaching of the Word was free for all men and in all places; The fourth, that open Crymes are in no wise to be suffered for any thing of greater Evil. Now, that *Hulse* himselfe was Catholike in all other points, appeareth from the Testimony of *Luther*, who thus speaketh of *Hulse*: The (2) *Papists* burned *Hulse*, when he parted not a fingers breadth from the Papacy: for he taught the same, which the *Papists* do; Only he did find fault with their vices, and wicked Lyfe; Against the Pope he did nothing. Thus *Luther* of *Hulse*. Now to the foresaid Heresies of *Hulse*, this is in like manner confessed and set downe by *M. Fox*, (a) to wit, that there are no Prin-

(2) In Colloq. German. cap. de Anti-christo.

(a) Fox Ad. Mon. 230

(b) In Epitom. Lutr. 25.

pag. 465.

ces, Priests, or Bishops, while they are in mortal Sinne. Of which his Heresy *Osiander* thus discourseth: Nullus (b) est Dominus (imilis, nullus est Prelatus, nullus est Episcopus, dum est in mortali peccato; Hæc propositio non potest approbari &c.

To come to *Wicleffe*, (who was first a Catholike Priest) *Io. Stow* thus relateth: *Wicleffe*

Wicliffe (c) first inuenged against the Church of (c) Stow
 Rome, because he had bene deprived by the in his
 Archbishop of Canterbury from a certaine Be- Annals
 nefice. Touching the Catholike opinions e- of En-
 ner houlden by Wicliffe (among others) I gland
 alledge these following: He maintayned printed
 (besides Baptisme and the Eucharist) the Sa- an. 1501.
 craments of Order, and of Penance: in like sort P. 425.
 the Sacraments of Confirmation and Extreme (d) As
 Unction. For in Postilla in c. 13. Marci, Wicliffe appeareth
 mentioneth all the seauen Sacraments. He in his
 also belieued the Rites and (d) Ceremonies of booke, de
 the Masse. He was feruerous in praying to ApoBa-
 our B. Lady thus writing of this point: Hic fia c. 13.
 (e) videtur mihi, quod impossibile est prauari cliff hr.
 sine Maria suffragio. He acknowledged the de As-
 worship of Reliques and Images, saying here- sumpt.
 of: Conceditur, quod Imagines cum prudentia Mariae.
 sunt adorande. Finally Wicliffe so admitted the (f) Wi-
 doctrine of Merit of Works, and Works of Sa- c'est de
 pererogation, as that Stow thus writeth of Eucha-
 him: Wicliffe (g) & his Disciples went in Confe- milia c. 8.
 rufet garments downe to the heele; seemed to con- (g) Stow
 temne all temporall goods for the lone of eternall in his
 riches; adioyned himselfe to the begging fryars. Annals,
 approuing their poverty, and extolling their Per- printed
 fection. 1592. fa.

The grosse Heresies maintayned by Wi- 426.
 cliffe, were these following: He taught, that all h) O-
 things came to passe by an absolute and Stoicall fander
 Necessity; he conuained lawfull Oathes, sauo- Cent. 15.
 ring herein (as Ofiander, h) sayth) of Ana- pag. 4174
 baptisme: & 439.

(h) Melancthon
in Ep. ad
Frederi-
cum Mi-
con. in
Epist.
Swinglij
et Oeco-
lamp.

(k) AA.

Mon.

pag. 95.

(l) Cal-
uin. Ep.

144.

(m) In
Tract. de
Eccl. Es.

pag. 124.

(n) In le-
gisism.

part. 2.

lib. 3. p.

170.

baptisme. He further taught, *that there is no Civill Magistrate, whiles he is in mortall Sinne, as Melancthon (i) chargeth him; Of whom Melancthon in the place alledged further sayth: I have found in Wicleff many Errors, whereby a man may indge of his Spirit. Finally to omit some other of his Heresies, M. Fox thus speaketh of him: Wicleffe (k) used to fien for feare of persecution and danger, to dissimble his Religion.*

Animaduersion CIII.

IN this next *Animaduersion* I will discourse vpon the former grounds, of these Inno- uatours following: And so begin with *Waldo*, from whom are sprung the *Waldenses*: *Waldo* was a Layman of *Lyons* in France; a rich man, and gaue Money for the translating of the Scripture into his owne tongue. Now that neither *Waldo*, nor the *Waldenses* were Protestants, is thus proued: First, they still did hould many Catholike poynts, as the *Real presence* in the B. Sacrament, as *Caluin* (l) confesseth. They also mantayned *Seauen Sacraments* the Doctrine of *vowes*, of *single Life*, and of *Purgatory*, as *Benedictus* (m) *Morgensstrensis*, a *Lutheran*, relateth. Finally they were so full in defending the Do- ctrine of *Merit of Works*, as that *D. Hamfrey* (n) thus writeth of *Waldo*: *Waldo did forsake all things, that being poore, he might follow Christ, and the Euangelicall Perfections.*

The

The Heresyces of the Waldenses were many: (o) Illy-
 First they taught, that Married Persons sin-
 ned in doing the Act of Matrimony, without ^{ricus in}
 hope of Issue, as witnesseth Illyricus (o): They <sup>Cata-
se-</sup>
 did hold all imbracements, and all things (p) <sup>stium ve-
risatis. p.</sup>
 done about the Girle, as kissing, touching, ^{741.}
 words, Compression of the Papps &c. to be ^{(p) Illyr.}
 done in Charity. They further taught that ^{ubi supr.}
 neither (q) Pryests, nor Civill Magistrates being: ^{(q) Illyri-}
 guilty of mortall Sinne, were to be obeyed. That ^{us ibid.}
 Laymen (r) and Women might Consecrate and ^{p. 700.}
 preach. That Cleargy (s) men ought to have no ^{(r, l. bid.}
 Possessions. They (t) wēt to Catholike Churches ^{p. 711 &}
 dissemblingly, & Confessed and Communicated (s) ^{ibidem, p.}
 dissemblingly. Finally (u) they condemned all ^{710.}
 Princes and Iudges. The Albigenſes are also ^{710.}
 prostituted by some of our Aduersaryes, (i) Illyr.
 for Protestants: But it appeareth by the ^{ibidem, p.}
 testimonyes of D. Abbots, that the Albigen- ^{714.}
 ſes, were of the same Sect of the Waldenses, (u) Illyr.
 or rather the same Men; for thus the ſaid ^{ibidem.}
 Doctour writeth: These (x) Leonists or poore ^{p. 731.}
 Men of Lyons, and Waldenses, and Albigenſes, ^{& 735.}
 were the same Men, but diuersly, and vpon di- ^{(x) In bis}
 vers occasions tearmed by the Romish Synagoge. ^{bo. he a.}

Now these Albigenſes (whether they were ^{D Hill}
 the same with the Waldenses or not) as they ^{bis} Rea-
 mantayned some Poynts of Protestancy; ^{ions,}
 ſo withall by the testimony of Oſiander (the ^{pag. 57.}
 Protestant) they taught diuers execrable (y) ^{Oſi-}
 Heresyces: Oſiander his words are these (y) ^{ander in}
 Albigenſibus dogmata hæc tribuntur: Dno eſſe Cens. 1. l. 1.
 Princip. 4, Deus vñ. bonum, & Deus malum, l. c. 4. p.

hoc est Diabolum &c. These opinions are ascribed to the Albigenſes; That there are two principles, to wit, a good God, and a bad God, which is the Dinell, who created all Bodies as the good God did all Soules &c. They do reiect Baptiſme, and they ſay, to goe to Churches, and to pray in them, is not profitable &c. They condemne Marriage, and do allow, as holy, promiſcuous concubitus, all promiſcuous lying together, be it wicked ſomer: They deny the Reſurrection of the Body, and that Chriſt was true Man. Thus far Oſiander of the Albigenſes in the place cited in the margent. I will conclude with Berengarius, who liued anno 1051. who is

(2) *Ad.*

Mon. pa.

13.

(*) In

Oecolam.

& *Sum.*

glij Epi-

ſtolis, l. 3.

pag. 710.

challenged for a (2) Proteſtant for his denial of Tranſubſtantiation, though he after recanted this his Herely. Now Berengarius did hould diuers Heresy'es, ſo as the Proteſtāt *Oecolampadius* (*) thus writeth of him: *Berengarius nonnulla affirmat aduerſus Baptiſmum parvulorum, & Coniugium.* Againe, *Damnata eſt Berengarij opinio, Sacerdotio Chriſtiano parum nimis tribuens.* Thus farre of all theſe former Heretykes, to wit, *Hns*, *Wiclef*, *Waldo*, and the reſt, whereby the indifferent Reader may reſt aſſured, that they cannot with any iuſt ſhew of Reaſon and indgemēt be alledged for Proteſtants, as our Adverſaryes are accuſtomed to alledge them, for the prouing of the *viſibility* of the Proteſtant Church in former Ages.

Ant.

Animaduerſion CIV.

Admitting for the tyme, that all theſe former Innouatours were entyre Proteſtants in all Poynts, not comparting with the Catholikes in any poynt of the Roman Religion: Admitting alſo, that not any of them did hold any one explore Hereſy, & by all ſydes condemned; yet are the examples of them moſt inſufficient for the ſupporting of the Proteſtants Churches *viſibility*. My Reaſons are theſe. Firſt: The *Scriptures* (a) do proue, that the Church of Chriſt (a) *Eſay. 60. 1. 49. 1. Timoth. 4. beſydes many o-* muſt not at one only tyme or other, but in all tymes, and in all ages, without the leaſt Interruption or diſcontinuance (much leſſe without interruption of many hundred yeares together) be moſt viſible and conſpicuous. This being granted, I then demand, what Proteſtants can be alledged li- uing betweene Anno ſix hundred and ſeaten, and anno 1220. Heere are about ſix hundred yeares betweene theſe two tymes during all which period, as alſo for euery yeare thereof, our Aduerſaries ſtand obliged to alledge Proteſtants, for the Continuance of the viſibility of the Proteſtant Church. But this they are not able to effect. And therefore D. Fawks with iuſt cauſe thus complayneth of the Inuiſibility of the Proteſtant Church: (b) *The Church in the tyme of Boniface the third (which was anno 607.)* (b) *D. Fu ke in his anſ- were to a Counter- ſeyes Catholike. pag. 10.*

was inuisible, and fled into the wilderness; there to remayne a long season. Secondly: All the former men, I meane Huffle, Wicleffe, Waldo &c. were originally Catholikes; and after by forging of new Doctrines, they deuided themselves from the Church then in Being; and so thereby they iustified in themselves those words of S.

(c) Iohn:
9.

Iohn: (c) *They went out of vs.* Now this departure or going out of the Church implyeth (in lieu of the continuance and visibility of their Church) an interruption, discontinuance, & defection of their Church, (and consequently a want of the visibility of the said Church: Since it infallibly pro-ueth, that the Doctrines taught by these Men after their departure, were not taught by the Church afore in being: For if they had bene taught by it, these Men needed not to leaue the then knowne Church, for their defending and teaching of the said Doctrines. Thirdly: The Protestants will say no doubt, that Huffle, Wicleffe &c. did preach the word of God, and administer the Sacraments. Heare then I demand, seing no

(d) Hebr.
5.

man taketh to himself the honour of priesthood, but he that is called (d) of God, as Aaron was; Who then did call Huffle, Wicleffe, Berengarius, the Waldenses &c. to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments, or by whom were they sent? But here our Adversaries are at a stand, flying to an immediate, imaginary, and aery Calling: For thus
dorb

doth Calvin seeke to salve this difficulty:
Quia (c) *Papæ tyrannide &c.* Because through (c) *Las-*
the tyranny of the Pope, true succession of ordi- cit. (the
 nation was broken of; therefore we stand in need Pro-
 of a new Course herein; And this function or *stant* re-
 calling was altogether extraordinary. With citib
 whom agreeth M. Perkins saying: *The* (*) *cal-* this say-
 ling of Wicliffe, Huffle, Luther, Ocolampadius, Pe- ing of
 ter Martyr &c. was extraordinary. An exor- Calvin.
 bitant, and phantasticall Conceite. lib. de
 Ressor.
 Musco-
 uit. &c.

Animaduersion CV.

Here are two Reasons (among others) religious;
 which evidently proue, that our Aduer- c. 11.
 saries are conscious, and guilty of their (*) *M.*
 owne Churches Inuisibility. One, in that, Perkins
 they discover a wondrousfull reluctance & is his
 backwardnes, when they are pressed by the works,
 Catholikes to name the Protestants living printed.
 in such and such ages; sortably hereto we 1605.
 find D. Fulke thus to complayne: *Proferre* (f) fol. 916.
me imbes toto Orbelatitantes, Et vah quamini- (f) *Fulke;*
quum postulas? Thou wiltst we to produce and disue-
 name those men, who did lye hidd throughout the ref. Ec-
 World. How uniuist a thing dost thou here de- clif. p. 39.
 mand? And D. Wotton complayning in the .
 like manner, thus concludeth: *Prone* (g) *you,* (g) *In his*
that our Religion was no where helds This stands answere
upon you to disprone, which when you do by par- to a Por-
ticular Record, you shall have particular Ans- pish
wers. Then which what can be first more ab- Pam-
 surdly spoken, as expecting record of things phar. p.
 which neuer were in being. He furthermore u.
 M 3. trans.

transferring the part of proving vpon Catholikes, to which himself and his fellows only stand obliged. The second Reason discovering their tergiversation herein, is in that, when they are prest to instance in Protestants for severall ages, they in lieu of Instancing flye to the *Scripture*, then disputing, *the true Church of Christ must ever be Visible; but theirs is the true Church, as it is proved out of the Scriptures; Therefore their Church was ever visible.* A most strang, and despayring Circulation.

Animaduerſion CVI.

THE like guiltines of our Aduersaries is shewed touching the supposed change of the Fayth of the Church of Rome. For though this (if any such change were) be to be proved (as being matter of fact) from History; yet our Aduersaries disclaime from all History herein. For D. *Whitaker* thus writeth: *It is not (h) needfull to search out of Histories the beginning of this change.* And againe: *It is (i) sufficient, by comparing the Popish opinions with the Scripture, to discover the disparity of sayth betweene them and vs; And as for Historiographers, we giue them liberty to write what they will.* Thus bringing the Question as they did about touching the visibility of the Protestant Church, to the *Scriptures*, and their owne interpretation of the said *Scriptures*. Which disclaime of theirs from History herein, is most vnusuall and vnaccusto-

(b) *Whitaker*, contra *Dunham* p. 277.
(i) *Whitaker*, contra *Dunham* p. 478.

accustomed; since it hath bene ever the Office of Historiographers & generall Councils, to register and record any new arising Heresy, or change in Fayth and Religion.

Animaduerſion CVII.

I T cannot be denied, but that a Catholike may commonly become ſooner *Superſtitious*, then a Protestant; And a Protestant ſooner become an *Atheiſt*, then a Catholike. The Reason of both is euident: And firſt, whereas the Catholike Religion (beſides the beliefc of many dogmaticall points of fayth) retayneth the practiſe of many *Ceremonies*; the true uſe of which *Ceremonies*, as being firſt inſtituted by the primitiue Church, are moſt lawfull; but now if the ignorant Catholike (through want of due inſtruction) do aſcribe more to them, then is due, or do put greater confidence in them, then he ought, (as forgetting them to be but *Ceremonies*) then perhaps he may haue a ſuperſtitious conceite of them; as it happened in the *Brazen Serpens*, though (otherwiſe ſeruing, as the figure of *Chriſt* :) To which the *Jewes* (through abuſe thereof, & in aſcribing more worſhip to it, then they ought) at length bare a *Superſtitious* reſpect. But now touching the Protestants greater propenſion to *Atheiſme*, the reaſon is, in that Proteſtancy euer reſynes it ſelfe by *Negatiues*. Thus for example, The *Caluiſt* or *Parisian* denies more, then *Lutheran*,

or the moderate Protestants; The *Anabaptists*, more then the *Paritans*; The *Anti-trinitarians* more then the *Anabaptists*; the *Jews or Turks*, more then the *Anti-trinitarians*; and for the last sublimation through deniall of all, *Judaisme* and *Turcisme* resolves into *Atheisme*. And hereupon we find, that whereas many Protestants by their often refyning of their Religion (and all by *Negatives*) do in the end become *Atheists* denying euen the being of a *Deity*; that few, or no *Catholikes*, immediatly from *Catholike Religion*, euer fall into the open *Blasphemy* of *Atheisme*.

Animaaduersion CVIII.

THe preaching of the *Word and Sacraments* (supposing them to be *Notes* of the Church, as our *Aduersaries* do suggest) proue only the *Place*, where the Church is, but not which is the Church; For the Church consisteth of men, and we cannot tell, who they are, that receaue the *Word* truly preached, or the *Sacraments* truly administered. Againe, whereas (as *Lubbertus*

(k) L. 4. (k) a Protestant truly teacheth) *Notus est de Eccles. duplex; unum Nature, alterum nobis*. Now here the Question is only of such *Notes*, as are *Notes* in respect of vs, for our better informing which is the true Church, and not as they are *Notes* in respect of *Nature*; For here we are instructed *a posteriori*, and according to the measure of that knowledg, which God vouchsafes to afford to vs. Now

in reference hereto we freely grant, that the true preaching of the word, and Administration of the Sacraments may be termed *Notes* of the Church, but not *Notes* to vs, (which is only the point here stood vpon): For though they be *Notes* (in Nature) of the truth of the Church, yet what doth this auayle vs, since they are not *Notes* to vs for our direction, to find which is the true Church? Againe, the true preaching of the word, and the Administration of the Sacraments cannot be *Notes* to vs, which is the true Church; seeing the *Scripture* it selfe cannot be made knowne to vs for *Scripture*, but only by the attestation of the Church, as M. Hooker testifieth in these words: Of (1) *things necessary, the very chiefest is, to know, what Bookes we are to esteeme holy, which is confessed impossible for the Scripture is selfe to teach.* And againe: We (m) all know, the first outward Motiue to esteeme of the Scripture, is the authority of the Church. Thus he. Now this being granted, it ineuitably followeth, that first we must know, which is the true Church to giue this approbation of the Scripture, before we can know, which is the Scripture; and much more then before we can be assured of the true preaching of the word, and which is the true construction of the Scripture. To these former Arguments I adioyne this pertinent obseruation; It is this: When the Catholikes demand to set downe the true *Notes* of the Church, & our

(1) Hooker in
Eccles.
Pol. l. 2.
p. 36.
(m) Vbi
supra. l. 3.
p. 146.

or the moderate Protestants; The *Anabaptists*, more then the *Puritans*; The *Anti-trinitarians* more then the *Anabaptists*; the *Jews or Turks*, more then the *Anti-trinitarians*; and for the last sublimation through deniall of all, *Judaisme* and *Turcisme* resolves into Atheisme. And hereupon we find, that whereas many Protestants by their often refyning of their Religion (and all by *Negatives*) do in the end become *Atheists* denying euen the being of a *Deity*; that few, or no *Catholikes*, immediatly from *Catholike* Religion, euer fall into the open Blasphemy of *Atheisme*.

Animaduersion CVIII.

THe preaching of the *Word and Sacraments* (supposing them to be *Notes* of the Church, as our Aduersaries do suggest) proue only the *Place*, where the Church is, but not which is the Church; For the Church consisteth of men, and we cannot tell, who they are, that receaue the *Word* truly preached, or the *Sacraments* truly administered. Againe, whereas (as *Lubbertus*

(k) *L. 4.* (k) a Protestant truly teacheth) *Notus est de Eccles. duplex; unum Naturæ, alterum nobis.* Now here the Question is only of such *Notes*, as are *Notes* in respect of vs, for our better informing which is the true Church, and not as they are *Notes* in respect of *Nature*; For here we are instructed *a posteriori*, and according to the measure of that knowledg, which God vouchsafes to afford to vs. Now

in reference hereto we freely grant, that the true preaching of the word, and Administration of the Sacraments may be termed *Notes* of the Church, but not *Notes* to vs, (which is only the point here stood vpon): For though they be *Notes* (in Nature) of the truth of the Church, yet what doth this auayle vs, since they are not *Notes* to vs for our direction, to find which is the true Church? Again, the true preaching of the word, and the Administration of the Sacraments cannot be *Notes* to vs, which is the true Church; seeing the *Scripture* it selfe cannot be made knowne to vs for *Scripture*, but only by the attestation of the Church, as M. Hooker testifieth in these words: Of (1) things necessary, the very chiefest is, to know, what Bookes we are to esteeme holy, which is confessed impossible for the *Scripture* it selfe to teach. And againe: We (m) all know, the first outward Motiue to esteeme of the *Scripture*, is the authority of the Church. Thus he. Now this being granted, it ineuitably followeth, that first we must know, which is the true Church to giue this approbation of the *Scripture*, before we can know, which is the *Scripture*; and much more then before we can be assured of the true preaching of the Word, and which is the true construction of the *Scripture*. To these former Arguments I adioyne this pertinent obseruation; It is this: When the Catholikes demand to set downe the true *Notes* of the Church, & our

(1) Hooker in
Eccles.
Pol. sec.
14. l. 2.
pag. 36.
(m) Vbi
supra. l. 2.
p. 146.

Aduersaries answering, That is the true Church, which enioyeth a true preaching of the Word, and an auayleable administration of the Sacraments; Now I here affirme, that this description of Notes is but our owne Question returned vs back in other termes, and consequently but a *Sophisme*, consisting in an idle circulation of the same points, inuested with a new forme of words: For when I demand, which is the true Church? virtually, implicitly, and according to the immediate meaning of my words, demand which Church is that, which enioyeth the true preaching of the word, and the true vse of the Sacraments? since only the true Church is honored with this kind of preaching, and distribution of the Sacraments. Thus far touching the Notes prostituted by our Aduersaries, as the true Notes of Christs Church.

Animaduersion CIX.

S^Vch Protestants, as do mantayne, that there were Protestants in all ages before Luther, giue the reason, that the feare of Persecution, was the cause, why the said Protestants did then lye latent, and became not visible to the world. But this is a meere aëry suggestion: For thus I argue: The Church of God vnder persecution, either communicateth openly with a false visible Church, in participation of Sacraments and externall professio of sayth, Or els she doth
refrayne

frayne from all such externall Commu-
 nion: if she do communicate with a false I-
 dolatrous Church (as diuers of our Aduer-
 saries repute the Church of Rome to be)
 then is she not the true Church, since the true
 Church cannot brooke any such diffimu- (n) Roma
 lation: For we read; *With the bare* (n) Md 10.
beliceth unto Iustice, and with the mouth con-
fesseth unto Salvation. If she doth not com-
 municate with it, then by such her forbea-
 ring, she is made knowne, and consequen-
 tly is become thereby *visible*: for who are
 persecuted, but Men, that are knowne? Or
 how can one lying secretly and hiddenly, be
 said to be persecuted? The truth of this
 point is further warrantable from the ex-
 amples of the persecution in the primitive
 Church; which of all other pressures of the
 Church, was incomparably the greatest.
 And yet we fynd, that the particular *Bishops,*
Confessours, and Martyrs are euen to this day
 made knowne, who they were, & what false
 Opinions, and Heresies they impugned.
 And the like may be said of the *English Ca-*
tholiks, persecuted in *Queens Elizabeths*
 reigne; since the names and memoryes of
 those reuerend Pryests, and others of the
 Laity (to speake nothing of many worthy
 Confessours and other suffering great losses
 and disgraces) who lost their lyues in her
 dayes only for Religion, are euen to this
 day fresh and recorded. Therefore I heare
 demanded, that if the Catholiks in this our
 Coun-

Country (being but a small part of Christendome) could not but for some few numbers of yeares in comparifon, escape the search and hands of their persecutours, and become thereby most visible & knowne; How could then the Protestants (being supposed to be dispersed throughout many Nations) lye hid, and auoyd for so many ages together (as is pretended) the force of that persecution, which is affirmed by our Aduersaries, to haue beene more grievous, then euer this of England was.

Animaduersion CX.

Whereas our Aduersaries do further vrg in behalfe of the being of Protestants in former Ages, that it is often obserued, that a little quantity of Copper is in a counterfeyte Coyne of Gold, & chaffe is mingled with Corne; and yet neither is the Copper, Gold; nor the Chaffe, Corne; so say they, the Protestant Church, was in former ages in the Papacy; The Papacy was in the Protestant Church, and yet the Protestant Church was not in the Papacy. According hereto M. Perkins saith: The (o) Church of Rome may be said to be in the Church of God, & the Church of God in the Church of Rome; with whom agreeth Beza thus waiting. Voluit (p) Dens in Papatu seruare Ecclesiam, etsi Papatus sak. l. de non est Ecclesia. And D. Whitaker: (q) Ecclesia Eccles. vera fuit in papatu, sed papatus non fuit Eccles. pag. 167. To this I reply, and say, it is but a froath

(o) In
his reformed
Catholike.

pag. 318.

or 319.

(p) In

Epist.

Theol.

Epist. 1.

pag. 11.

(q) Whi

Deus in Papatu

seruare Ecclesiam,

etsi Papatus

non est Ecclesia.

And D. Whitaker:

(q) Ecclesia

vera fuit in papatu,

sed papatus non fuit Eccles.

pag. 167.

To this I reply, and say, it is but a froath

of

of words artificially put together. Howsoever many of our Aduersaries much please themselves with this conceited Answer: Therefore for the better examining thereof, we are here to conceaue, that the sense and meaning of these words, is not, that the Protestant Church had in those tymes a latent and hidden being in Catholike Countries, without hauing entercourse & communion with the then knowne and visible Church in the Sacraments: for so the true Church could not be said to be in the papacy, no more then at this day in respect of its like abroad in *Turkish Countries*, it can be said to be in *Turcisme*. Therefore the particular manner of this strange mixture (as it appears in shew of words) is thus truly expressed by *Osiander* the Protestant in this manner: (1) *Quod semper sub Papatu, aliqui pij homines fuerint &c.* No man denyeth but that there were under the papacy some holy men, who disliked the Errors of the Popes, although they durst not openly professe so much; nisi ardere, aut ad minimum exulare velint, except they would burne for their Religion, or at least suffer banishment. Thus we see, the last sublimated sense of the former quaynt sentence resolves to this point; To wit, that the Protestant Church in those former tymes, (being in, or vnder the Papacy) did through feare of burning or banishment, dissemble their Religion, and communicate in all externall right with the Church of Rome.

Ani-

(r) In Epistol.
Cent. 16.
part. al.
6174 p.
1070. &
1071.

Animaduerſion CXI.

THE Confessed Inuifibility of the Proteſtant Church (about ſet downe) during ſo many former ages , doth potentially and vertually include the prooſe of the *uiſibility* of the *Roman Church* , during all the ſaid ages : Seing the *Iuuiſibility* of the Proteſtane Church for ſo long a tyme , is aſcribed by the Proteſtants themſelues to the worke of *Antichriſt* (they meaning therby the Pope , and the Church of Rome) as appeareth by ſeuerall testimonyes of our Aduerſaryes where in this Treatiſe expreſſed ; & particularly of M. Napper thus ſaying : *Betweene* (s) *the yeares of Chriſt 300. and 316. the Antichriſtian, & Popiſticall reigne began, reigning vniuerſally without any debatable contradiction 1260. yeares.* And accordingly the Centuriſt (t) charge all the ages from *Constantine* till *Luther* , with Popiſtry. Thus an acknowledged defection of the Proteſtant Church for many Centuries , doth (by our Aduerſaryes owne Confeſſion) neceſſarily include and imply a Continuall *uiſibility* of the Catholike Roman Church during all the ſaid Centuries.

Animaduerſion CXII.

TOUCHING the ſuppoſed change of the ſayth of Rome , I will deuyde in theſe three next *Animaduerſions* all the Ages from the Apoſtles euen to *Luthers* days into three ſeuerall

(s) Napper in his
Treatiſe
vpon the
Reuelat.
pag. 68.
(t) See
this in
Cent. 4.
and ſo
ſucceſſi-
uely in
Euery
Century.

seuerall Stations, or *Periods* of tymes: First then, we will see how long it is granted by the Protestants, that Rome^d did perseuere without any alteration of her Primitiue faith. Secondly, we will set downe the acknowledged continuance of that tyme, during all which season the now present sayth of Rome hath continued; that is, how long *Papistry* (as our Aduersaries terme it) hath bene publikly professed throughout all Christendome. Thirdly, and lastly, we will then take a view of the tymes, betweene these two former seuerall tymes: For these two tymes being once acknowledged on all sydes (to wit, the tyme, during which the Church of Rome confessedly kept her first sayth taught by the Apostles; and the tyme, during which the present Roman sayth hath continued from this day vppward) it ineuitably followeth, that this supposed change in Religion, did either happen in the *Interstitium*, and meane tyme, betweene these two former *Periods* of tymes, or els that there happened no such change of Religion in the Church of Rome at all. Now, concerning the first of these tymes, it is granted by the Protestants, that Rome retayned her purity of sayth without any alteration from the Apostles tymes, till after the death of *Optatus*, *Epiphanius*, and *Austin*, which is during the space of foure hundred and fourty yeares after *Christ*: This I thus proue. Whereas our Catholike writers

writers haue much insisted for prooffe of their Religion in the succession of the Bishop of Rome euen vntill *Anstins* dayes, by the Example of *Irenaus*, *Cyprian*, *Optatus*, *Ierome*, *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, and *Anstins*. *D. Fulke* answereth in behalfe of these Fathers in this sort; That (*) these Fathers especially

(*) *Fulke* in his confutation of Purgatory. p. 372.

(*) *D. Fulke*, in his Re- tentive. pag. 89.

named the Church of Rome, it was because the Church of Rome at that tyme, as it was founded by the Apostles, so it continued in the Doctrine of the Apostles; which Doctour in another place thus further writeth: The (*) Popish Church &c. departed from the vniuersall Church of Christ long after *Anstins* departure out of this Lyfe. Thus he, granting that till after *Anstins* death the Church of Rome remained the true Church. In like manner, *D. Iewell* accordeth with *D. Fulke* herein touching the Argument drawne by those foresaid Fathers, from succession of the Bishops

(u) *D. Iewell* in other godly Fathers rightly yeilded Renertue his reply to the Sea of Rome, &c. For the purity of Religion, which was there preserved a long tyme Harding without spot. To conclude, *Caluin* himselfe pag. 246.

(x) In his 1. 4. cap. 2. Sect. 3.

of Rome saying: As (u) well *Anstins*, as also *Iewell* in other godly Fathers rightly yeilded Renertue his reply to the Sea of Rome, &c. For the purity of Religion, which was there preserved a long tyme Harding without spot. To conclude, *Caluin* himselfe maketh good the foresaid Argument, taken from the Succession of the Bishops of Rome insisted vpon by *Irenaus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Anstins*, and *Epiphanius*, in these words: Cum (x) extra controuersiam erat, nihil a principio vsque ad etatem illam mutatum fuisse in Doctrina &c. Seeing it was a point out of Controuersy, that nothing in Do-

ctrine

from the beginning to that very age was changed, these holy fathers did take, which they thought sufficient for the destroying of all new Errors; to wit, the Doctrine constantly and with an unanimous consent, retayned euen from the Apostles dayes till their tymes. Thus farre Caluin. And so far now concerning the duration of the tymes (euen by the Protestants frequent Confessions) that no change of sayth was made in the Church of Rome.

Animaduerſion CXIII.

IN this next *Animaduerſion*, we will take in to our consideration the number of those ages, during the length of all which from this day vpward, the present Roman faith hath (by the like Confessions of the learned Protestants) beene generally taught; since how long the Protestants do grāt, that the Church of Rome hath from this day continued in her present sayth; so long it followeth by their owne implicite (but necessary) censures, that the Church of Rome neuer altered her sayth. Now, this poynt appeareth from the wrytings of D. Humphrey (aboue alledged) who shewing what Reli- (y) D. gion Austin the Monke, sent by Gregory Hum- the Great (who liued in the yeare 590) pla- frey, in- ted in England, thus confesseth: *In Eccle. Iesui- sam (y) quid inuenerunt Gregorius & Au- uism. gellinus? Onus Ceremoniarum &c.* What did Ar. a. Gregory and Austin bring into the Church? A. ras. s. burden of Ceremonies. They did bring in the Ar- pag. 927.

N

chis-

chiepiscopall Pall, for the Solemnization of the Masse; They did bring in Purgatory &c. in the Oblation of the healesfull Host, and prayes for the Dead &c. Relicks, Transubstantiation &c. a new Consecration of Temples &c. from all which what other thing is effected, then the introducing of Indulgences, Monachisme, Popisme, and the rest of the Chaos of Popish superstitions. All this did Austin, the greater Monke, bring instructed herein by Gregory the Monke, bring unto English men. Thus D. Humfrey. Now from hence it appeareth, that at S. Gregory his sending of Austin into England (which was about a thousand years since) our present Roman Religion was then wholly, and publickly practized in Rome; and that if the Church of Rome had suffered any change in fayth from that, first taught by the Apostles, that this change should haue beene made, not since, but before Gregoryes tyme, and before he had sent Austin to plant in England the fayth of Christ. In further confirmation of D. Humfreys iudgement herein, I may alledge the Centurists, who in their *Index, or Alphabeticall Table of the first Century, at the word, Gregory*, do set downe with particular figures of references, where euery such mentioned Opiniõ may be found, as followeth: *Eiusdem error de bonis operibus, de Confessione, de Cõiugio, de Ecclesia, de satisfactionum inuocatione, de Inferno, de libero arbitrio, de Iustificatiõne, de purgatorio, de penitentia, de satisfactiõne &c.* Briefly, with all other par-

particular points, mantayned by the now
 present Church of Rome. The lesse won-
 der therfore, that *Danans* (resting vpon his
 owne false principles) thus wryteth of our
 Conuerſion: *Purgatio* (2) *illa quam Gregorius* (2) *Da-*
primus fecit &c. *fuit inebriatio Meretricis mī-* *naus in*
doſaſta, de qua eſt Apocalyp. c. 17. & 18. thus *reſponſ. ad*
 referring our Conuerſion to Chriſtianity, to *diſputat.*
 the worke of *Antichriſt*. Now from theſe *Bellarmin.*
 former acknowledgments of the learned Pro- *part. 1.*
 teſtants we may infallibly conclude, that *pag. 780.*
 from this day, till we arriue at leaſt to the
 age of the foreſaid *S. Gregory* (who liued
 about a thouſand yeares ſince) the preſent
 Roman and Catholike Religion was tau-
 gh (beſides in our Country) in diuers other
 Countreyes; and conſequently ſeing thoſe
 Countreyes did receaue their Inſtructions in
 ſayth frō Rome, it inauoydably followeth,
 that during all this tyme not any innouati-
 on or change in ſayth was introduced into
 the Church of Rome.

Animaduerſion CXIV.

NOW in this third place, we are to take
 into our Conſideration, the number of
 yeares, which paſſed betweene the firſt
 foure hundred and forty yeares from
 Chriſt, and theſe laſt thouſand yeares from
 vs; which number, ſeing it is ſixteene hun-
 dred yeares and more from Chriſt to vs, a-
 mounteth to about *one hundred, and ſixty*
yeares. Well then, if here we can proue, that

no change of fayth was made in the Church of Rome, within the compasse of this 160. yeares, then followeth it inauoydably, that the Church of Rome neuer to this day, hath suffered any alteration in fayth and Religion, since it first imbraced the Christian fayth. This point I then first proue from the doctrine, which was belieued and generally taught, at such tyme as *Constantine* (who was our first Christian Emperour) was conuerted to Christianity, which was about the yeare, three hundred and twenty after Christ, and therefore before the foresaid one hundred & sixty yeares. Now that the fayth in *Constantine* tyme was the same, that the Church of Rome professeth at this present, appeareth from the frequent testimonies of the *Centurists*, who most elaborately and punctually do record all the particular Articles of the present Roman fayth, to be belieued most constantly by the said *Constantine*, and by the age, wherein belieued. Touching the fayth of *Constantine*, and that age, the *Centurists* spend seuerall *Columnes* of the fourth *Century*, to wit from *Columnne* 452. to *Columnne* 497. and *D. Whitaker* affirmeth, that *Leo* (who was Pope anno 440.) was a great (a) Architect of the Antichristian Kingdome. Now from all this I necessarily euict, that no change of the faith of Rome was made in the compasse of the said one hundred sixty yeares; which tyme was set downe betweene the confessed pe-

(a) D.
Whitak.
contra
Ballar.
pag. 37.

riod of the Churches purity, and the acknowledged generall Doctrine of the Church of Rome.

But now to recapitulate the Contents of these three last *Animadversions* (which beare anecessary dependency and reference one to another; I thus make my deduction. First, if the Church of Rome remayned in her purity of fayth without any change, for the first foure hundred and forty yeares; Secondly, if it be confessed that for this last thousand yeares the Church of Rome ever professed the same fayth, without any change, which at this day it professeth; Thirdly, if it be made cleare, that during the *Interstitium* of tyme betweene the first 440. yeares, and this last thousand yeares, which is but 160. yeares, no change in fayth was made, as appeareth from the fayth of *Constantine* our first *Christian Emperour*, and the Fathers of that age: What demonstration more certaine and infallible, then that the present Church of Rome neuer made any change of fayth and Religion since the Apostles tymes, but that she ever preserved as pure and incorrupt, the very same fayth and Religion, which *S. Peter*, *S. Paul*, and other the Apostles first planted in her? And this Demonstration (for I can terme it no lesse) I present to the mature and diligent perusall of the Iudicious Reader; assuring him, that all the learned Protestants of *Christendome* cannot giue any satisfactory

N 3

answere

answere therto; which demonstration I willingly acknowledge that I decerped out of that Booke heretofore mentioned, commonly called, *The Protestants Apology of the Roman Church*:

Animaduerſion CXV.

IF any man should yet rest vnſatisfyed, & be perſuaded that this imaginary change of ſayth in the Roman Church ſhould happen within the *Interſtitium* of the four hundred forty yeares, and the laſt thouſand yeares, which mid-tyme only containeth one hundred and ſixty yeares, as is in the three former *Animaduerſions* aboue ſhewed; then for the greater ſatisfaction of ſuch a Man I preſent to him (as an *Appendix* to the three laſt *Animaduerſions*) this obſervation and poinr following. It is this: Yf we conſider either the plurality of our Catholike Articles; or the incompatibility which diuers of them beare partly to our outward ſenſe, & partly to mans naturall propenſion; or the diuerſity of Countreyes and Nations in Chriſtendome, moſt remote one from another; all which our ſaid Catholike Religion is acknowledged wholly to poſſeſſe at the later end of the ſixt Age or Century: I ſay, if we conſider all theſe different circumſtances, the tyme of the ſaid one hundred ſixty yeares (within which moſt Proteſtants do reach this change did happen) is infinitely too ſlitle, and wholly diſproportionable.

nable; so that within the compass thereof, so great a change & alteration should be wrought; especially in such an admirable manner, that whereas in the beginning of the said 160. yeares, it is auerred by the Protestants, that not any one point of our Catholike Religion was then taught (as is aboue maintayned by them in acknowledging the purity of the sayth of Rome to continue vnto the beginning of the said 160. yeares) yet that at the end of the said 160. yeares it should so overflow all Christendome with such a violent streame, as that no sparke of Protestancy (supposing it were afore professed) or any other religion did remayne in any one Country or other, but that all was wholly extinct: Such an Imaginary change, and alteration in Religion (I say) as this, is more then stupendious and wonderfull; and such as since the creation of the world neuer afore happened. I further add hereto, that since the Heresies of the Nestorians, Pelagians, Donatists, Monothelites, (all which did spring vp within the compass of this foresaid 160. yeares) are (b) *Au.* particularly recorded by S. *Austin*, (b) yea *Rim. Lds* also by the (c) *Centurists*; how then can we *Haresf.* dreame, that any points of our Roman Religion were first introduced as Innouations, 33. 39. and yet no record of them to remayne in (c) *Cen.* any History whatsoever? Furthermore, for *curists*, the close of all, I add, that in, or (which is *Cens. 20.* more strange) next before the beginning of *Col. 311.*

the said 160. diuers Articles of *Protestancy* were condemned for *Innouations*; as the deniall of prayer, and offering vp sacrifice for the Dead, and of appointed fasts, as singular Noueltyes in *Aerius*, as *Austin* witnesseth Hæres. 53. In like sort the Deniall of *Praying* to Saints, and worshipping of Saints *Relicks* was condemned in *Vigilantius*, as *Ierome* recordeth l. contra *Vigilant.* c. 2. & 3. The deniall of Priests power in remitting of *Sinne*, condemned for Nouelty, as the *Centurists* confesse, *Cent.* 4. col. 254. The like may be said of most other points of *Protestancy*, condemned as Noueltyes, either a litle before, or within the compasse of the foresaid 160. So euident it is, that no articles of our Catholike fayth, were brought in as *Innouations*, during the said period of 160. yeares.

Animaduerſion CXVI.

Whereas the Protestants do affirme a beginning (though most ancient) of diuers points of our Roman Catholike Religion; and that we Catholikes take aduantage of such their acknowledgments; yet cannot they with true reason thus reply against vs: *You admit the authorities of the Protestants, granting (for so many ages) the antiquity of the present Roman Religion, in such and such points of sayth: Therefore you are by force of reason, to admit their like authorities in saying, that at such a tyme, (and not before) those your*

Popish

Popish Articles were first taught; for seeing both these points are delivered by the Protestants in one, and the same testimony, or sentence; why should the one part be urged by you for true, and the other reiected as false? To this I answer, that our Aduersaries expect herein from vs, more then in equity can be demanded. My reason is this; In the authorities of this Nature, produced from our Aduersaries writings, we are to distinguish and seuer that, which the Aduersaries grant in behalfe of vs, from that, which they affirme to their owne aduantage, what they grant for vs, & against themselves: so far we are to imbrace their authority, seeing it may be presumed, as is in this Treatise elsewhere intimated, that ordinarily no learned man would confesse any thing against himselfe, but what the euidency of truth enforceeth him thereto. But what our Aduersaries affirme in fauour of their owne cause, and against vs, there we are not to stand to their authority, since no man is to be a witness in his owne behalfe; and it may be well and probably presumed, that such their Sentence proceedeth out of their owne partiality of their cause, and iudgment.

(d) Eph.

Animaduerſion CXVII.

4.
(e) Fulke

THE Apostle foretelleth vs, that *Pastours* (d) *and Doctours* are to be in the Church to the *Confirmation of Saints*, till we all meet in v. *unity of sayth*; that is, as D. Fulke (e) truly in-
 EPH. 4. *against the Rho- mist T. 4. Flam. in Eph. 4.*
 N 5 *terpre-*

terpreteth, for ever; which Pastours & Doctours prophecied by the Apostle, shall (as the said D. Pulke further auerreteth) always

(f) Pulke in his answers so a Counter-joye Catholike.

pag. 11.

(g) Whi ask, contra Duraum, l.

3. pag.

249.

(h) Esay. 61.

(f) resist all false Opinions with open reprehension. With whom conspires D. Whitaker herein saying: The (g) preaching of the word (within which is necessarily included the impugning of all false Doctrines) doth constitute the Church; the want thereof doth subvert it. According hereto we also thus read in Esay: (h) Upon thy Walls O Jerusalem, I have appointed Watchmen all the day, & at the night for ever; They shall not hold their peace. Now heare I thus vrge: Can any reasonable man thinke, that whereas the Protestants teach that the Papists Religion came in by degrees, and at severall tymes, that all the Pastors, Doctors, and Fathers of those severall tymes were a sleepe; when the said Doctrines were first broached; or that they observing their entrance, yet not any of them would vouchsafe to make resistance, or at least some mention of any such innovation in Doctrine; especially if we consider the nature of our Catholike Doctrines, auerred by the Protestants to be introduced, as Nouelties? Since they are, as above is intimated, many in number, diuers of them of the greatest consequence, that may be: As the verue of the Sacraments; the manner of our justification (to wit, whether by works, or by fayth only :) Others of them most repugnant to Mans sense and common

common Reason; as the *Real presence*; Some aduerse to Man's naturall propension, as the Doctrines of *Virginity*, *Pauerty*, & *Obedience*: most of them consisting not only in an internall beliefe, but even in an externall action and operation; and therefore the first entrance of them are become thereby most discernable: Such are the Doctrines of praying to the Saints, of praying vpon beades, *Pilgrimages*, *single life in the Clergy*, and (to omit diuers others) all *Machisines*; And lastly some (supposing their doctrine to be false) subiect to externall *Idolatry*, as the worshipping of *Christ* with supreme honour in the *Eucharist*. Here then I conclude, that if any man shall affirme, that these Doctrines could stealthingly creep in to gods Church, without all resistance of its Pastours, Doctours, and Fathers; and without any mention recorded of their first entrance; that Man not only giues the lye openly to the *Holy Scriptures* in seuerall places witnesssing the contrary; but that withall he ceaseth to be a man, by loosing wholly the naturall light of all humane discourse and Reason.

Animadversion CXVIII.

I T is most cleare, that the Heresies rising in the beginning of the primitive Church, as the Heresies of the *Valentinians*, *Tatianists*, *Manichees*, *Arians*, and diuers others, as also the Heresies of the foresaid Heretikes be-
fore

fore S. *Gregories* tyme, are recordeth both by the ancient Fathers, and euen by the *Centurists* our Aduersaries. In lyke sort the Heresies of *Berengarius*, *Waldo*, *Wicleffe* &c. are also registred. That this is most true, I proue from the *Centurists*, who in the fift Chapter of euery seuerall Century, from *Osiander* in his *Centuries*, from *Pantaleon* (the Protestant) in his *Cronology*, haue recorded all the said ancient Heresies. And as for *Berengarius*, *Laufrauncus*, *Guitmundus*, and *Algerus* make mention of his Heresy. *Waldo* is recorded by (i) *Illiricus*, as also by *Osiander* (k). *Wicleffe* by M. *Fox*, as also by *Stow*, and by *Wicleffe* owne writings, as is aboue shewed.

(i) In his
Catalog.
seffium
veritatis.

(k) In
Epitom.
bistor.
Beclis.

This then being most true and undeniable, I thus infer: Seeing it is manifest, that the Heresies, ryfing within the first foure hundred yeares; the Heresies budding vp the next two hundred yeares; the Heresies hatched in euery age during the last thousand yeares, are most largely recorded, partly in the wrytings of the ancient Fathers in particuler, and set Tracts against them; partly in the *Canons* of *General* *Councils* condemning them; partly by the obseruing diligence of *Ecclesiasticall Historiographers* (whose designed labour is to transmit, and commend ouer to after ages the true state of *Christs Church* in former ages) and partly by the Protestants like endeauiours, who haue written seuerall Volumes of this very subiect; Seing (I say) all this is manifest,

can it then enter into any brayne, but to weene, that so many Articles of the present Roman Religion, being in number far more, then all the aboue rehearsed; in weight and consequence greatly exceeding them; for diuersity of Countryes and Nations, far further diuulged and spread then all, or any of the former Heresies euer were (most of these others being restrayned only to one Country, or Nation) could euer so vnespiedly infect the whole Church of Christ with their Contagion, and worke a more notorious change therein, then euer yet was wrought by all the Heretiks since *Christs* tyme put together; And yet not one Father, Pastour, or Doctor of those times, either to take notice of any of those supposed Heresies; or knowing them, not to impugne the first assaults, by preaching or writing; neither any one Ecclesiasticall History but to mention in their Histories any one of the said Articles, or Innouations in fayth: Can this I say, be imagined? or can it be in the power of man thus to create a new Religion at his pleasure, without controule or discouery? To maintaine this, is to maintayne an assertion against all probability, against all reason, against all possibility.

Animaduerſion C X I X.

THe *Greeke Church* hath beene for many ages emulous of the Church of *Rome*; and therefore if the present Church of *Rome* had

had anciently made any division, or Seisme from the true Church of Christ, the *Grecians* (no doubt) would have been most apt to commend the memory of such a change in our Church to all after ages in their Historyes. But no such records we find in any of their writings. Yea the *Grecians* are so farre from that, as that (on the contrary side) the pre-

- (l) *Greg. l. 4. Ep. 34. & 36* sent Church of Rome is able to specify and note (out of most ancient and approued Authours) the very tymes, when the *Grecians* introduced those particular Opinions, wherein at this day they dissent from our Roman and Catholike Church. For example (to insist in some few;) The *Grecians* deniall of their Obedience to the Church of Rome, was first begunne by *Iohn of Constantinople*, and was written against by *Gregory (l) the Great*, and *Pelagius (m)*. Their deniall of the proceeding of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Sonne, tooke it beginning about the years 764. & was gained and contradicted at its first rising, as *Aug. l. 1. de Trinitate* (n) *Kekermanns* (a Protestant) witnesseth. Their Deniall of Prayer for the Dead, was begunne by *Aerius*, and impugned by *Epiphanius (o)* and *Austin (p)*. Finally their bringing in of *Leauenrum* Bread by the *Grecians*, in the celebration of the Eucharist, was first begunne about the years 1053. as appeareth out of the writings of *Leo (q)* the Nyth, and the (r) *Contarist*, 11. cap. 8. Now heere I demand; Can it be imagined, that

that these Innouations of the *Grecians*, being few in number, could be so precisely contradicted, gain-said, and left registred to all Posterity; and yet this supposed chāge of the *Church of Rome*, consisting in bringing in of farre more Articles in number, and as of great consequence, should neuer be noted, nor impugned by any one Doctour or Father, nor recorded, nor obserued by any one Historiographer; the said Fathers and Historiographers liuing in the very same Ages, wherein this supposed alteration is said to haue happened?

Animaduerſion C X X.

IT is certaine, that what generall propension *Nature*, or rather God himſelfe by *Nature*, as by his Instrument, hath ingrafted in all mē, the same is in it ſelfe moſt true, certaine; and warrantable; ſince otherwiſe it would follow, that God ſhould inſert in the Soule of Man, idly, vainly, and as directed to no end, certaine naturall impreſſiōs, and inſtinctions: which to affirme is moſt derogatory to his diuine maiesty and wiſedome, and repugnant to that auncient receaued *Axiome*, *God and Nature worke nothing in vayne*. Now to apply this againſt our *New-traliſts* in Religion, who thinke a Man may be ſaued in any Religion: We ſynd according hereto, both by Hiſtory & experience, that diuers zelous and ſeruent profeſſours of all Religions whatſocuer, both true and
false,

false, haue beene most ready to expose their liues, in defence of any impugned part or branch of their Religion; From which vndaunted resolution of theirs, we certainly collect, that this their constant determination of defending the least point of their Religion, proceedeth partly from a generall instinct of God, impressed in mans soule, teaching eeh man, that death it selfe is rather to be suffered, then we are to deny any part of sayth and Religion in generall. And thus according hereto we find, that the *Athenians*, who were *Heathens*, (though they did erre touching the particular *Object* therein, as worshipping false Gods) were most cautelous, that no one point should be infringed or violated touching the worshipping of their Gods. The like religious severity was practised by the *Iewes*, as *Iosephus* (s) witnesseth. Now from these *Premisses* we deduce, against our *Adiaphorists*, or *Neutralls* in Religion, either *Catholike*, or *Protestant*; that no points of true Religion are of that cold Indifferency, as that they are not to be much regarded either in beliefe, or in profession; but that they are of that Nature, worth, and dignity, as a man is obliged to vndergoe all torments, yea death it selfe, before he yeald, or suffer the least relaps in denying any of the said verities, or in any external Profession contrary thereto.

(s) Ioseph.
contra
Apion.

Animadversion CXXI.

For the further impugning of the indifference of severall Religions, and to shew that every religion among Christians is not capable of Salvation, I will draw one demonstration out of Scripture. The text is this: In the (t) later tymes, certaine shall (t) ^{1.} *Ti-* depart from the fayth, attending to spirits ^{moth.} of Errour, and Doctrine of Devils; forbid- ^{cap. 4.} ding to Marry, & to abstaine from Meates. Heere the Apostle prophesyeth according to the iudgement of *S. Chrysostome*, (u) *Am* (u) *Hom;* brose, (x) *Ierome*, (y) and (z) *Antin*; of the 12. in *Ti-* Heretykes *Encratites*, *Marcionists*, *Ebionites*, ^{moth.} and such like, who denyed *Matrimony*, as (x) *in* a thing altogether vnlawfull, and prohibi- ^{bunc lo-} ted absolutely at all tymes; and the eating ^{cum.} of certaine Meates, as Creatures impure. (y) *L.* Now these Heretykes belieued in the *Tri-* ^{contra} nity, the *Incarnation*, and other Supreme ^{loninian.} points of Christian Religion; And yet euē ^{c. 7.} for these two former Heresyēs, touching (z) *Har;* ^{25. &} *Marriage*, and eating of *Meates* (and not ^{40.} for their misbeleife in the *Trinity*, *Incarnation* &c.) they are said by the Apostle to depart from the fayth of Christ, and to attend to the Doctrine of *Devils*; But such as leave the fayth of Christ, and attend to the doctrine of the Devils, are not in state of Salvation. Now these Errours heere mentioned by the Apostle, are of as little, or lesser consequence, then the Controuersies

O be.

betweene the Catholiks, & the Protestants; therefore it standeth vpon ech Christian, (if so he expect to saue his soule) to profess entirely, and wholly the true Religion.

Animaduerſion CXXII.

Touching the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the B. Sacrament of the Eucharist, the auncient Fathers are most full therein, euen by the acknowledgement of the Protestants themselves. First then *Gregory the great*

(a) In *Insultism.*

part. 2.

cap. 1.

(b) *Cent.*

3. col.

317.

(c) *Cent.*

4. c. 4.

col. 293.

(d) *L. Ep.*

Oecolampad.

& *B. Wylinglij.*

l. 1.

(e) *Ep. ad*

Bezan.

annexed

to his

Common

places.

(f) *Page.*

211. &

218.

is confessed by *D. Humfrey* (a) to haue brought in *Transubstantiation* into England, at his first planting of Christianity in this Country, as is aboue shewed. *Chrysostome* is reprehended by the *Centurists*, to vse their owne words: (b) *Quia parum commodè de Transubstantiatione dixit. S. Ambrose* is affirmed by the *Centurists* (in the booke ascribed to *Ambrose*) to confirme the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; which Father for the said Doctrine is also taxed by (d) *Oecolampadus. S. Cyrill* is reprehended by *Peter* (e) *Martyr* in these words: *I will not easily subscribe to Cyrill, who affirmed such a Communion, as therein euen the flesh and blood of Christ is ioyned to the Blessings*; for so he calleth the holy bread &c. *S. Cyprian* is charged, in the booke ascribed to *Ursinus* (the Protestant) entituled: (*Conmoneſatio cuiusdam Theologi de ſancta Ceſa*, who there thus writeth: *In Cyprian are many things, which ſeeme to affirme Transubstantiation*. Lastly *Ignatius* is acknowledged by *Kemp-*

...itins (g) to haue confirmed the Doctrine of (g) Exa-
Transubstantiation, in that eminent place of *part. 2. p.*
 his: (h) *Eucharistias & oblationes nō admittūt*, 94.
quid non consistantur eucharistiam esse carnem (h) Ep.
saluatoris, quæ pro peccatis nostris passa est &c. ad Smir-

The truth of the Fathers iudgment tou-
 ching the *Reall* presence is so fully confessed
 by our Aduersaryes, as that *Antony de A-*
lamo (a markable Protestant) thusackno-
 ledgeth hereof. (i) *I haue not hitherto beene* (i) *In his*
able to know, when this Opinion of the *Reall & Anato-*
bodily being of Christ in the Eucharist did first my of the
beginne. With whome conspireth *Adamus Massæ. p.*
Francisci another Protestant) saying: *Com- 210.*
mentum k) Papiſtarum &c. The Papiſts in- (k) *In*
mention touching Transubstantiation, crept ca. Marga-
reth into the Church. Thu- farre of the Pro- *vin*
 testants Confessions in this poynt; where- *Thsol.*
 unto we may add, that these Fathers heere *pag. 156.*
 about charged, with the rest of the Fathers
 of those Ages, were the chiefe Pastours &
 Doctours of the Primitiue Church, which
 Church believed herein according as it was
 taught by the said Fathers: If then these
 Fathers should erre in the Doctrine of *Trā-*
substantiation, then should it follow, that
 the primitiue Church, yea and the vniuer-
 sall Church of Christ (contrary o Christs
 (l) promise) therein should erre. (l) *Matb*
10.

Animaduerſion CXXIII.

Y F we do take into due conſideration the ſeueral chiefe heades and points, when vnto the ſentences, and authorities of the ancient Fathers, touching the *Eucharift* may be reduced; we cannot otherwiſe be perſuaded, but that the Fathers taught vniſormouſly the Doctrin of the *Reali Preſence*, and *Transubſtantiation*: ſeing thoſe Heads of the Fathers ſentences are ſo agreeable and ſortable to *Chriſts Reali* being in the Sacrament, and ſo incompetent and diſproportionable to a bare *Typicall Preſence*, or being of him therein.

To begin then: The Firſt Head of the Fathers authorities may be the *Appellation* or *Names*, which the Fathers giue to the *Bleſſed Sacrament*, far differently from the *Sacramentaryes*; which is an argument, that *Sacramentaryes* differ from the Fathers in beleife therein. Thus the Fathers call the Sacrament, *The body & blond of our Lord*; *The precious body*; *tremenda Myſteria*, *the fearful Myſteries*; *the pledge of our Salvation*; *Our price*: whereas the *Sacramentaryes* vſuall phraſe is to call the *Eucharift*, the *Symbol*, or *ſign of the body and blond of the Lord*.

The ſecond Claſſe or Head is taken from the *Comparison of this Sacrament*, with other things; for they compare it with the *Manna*, *Paſchall Lamb*, with *Panis Propositionis*, and the lyke; ſaying, The *Eucharift* doth differ from

I. From all these things, as the *Truth* differs from
 figures, the body from a shadow, a celestiall
 Diuine, and inconsumptible thing, from a
 terrene and consumptible. They, in like
 manner compare the *Eucharist* with the my-
 steries of the *Incarnation*; They compare
Christ, as he is vpon the *Altar* in the Eu-
 charist, with *Christ* as he was in the *Cribbe*
 or *Manger*: They in like manner compare
Christ in the Eucharist with *Angels* appearing
 in corporall formes. Finally, they compare
 those men, who vnworthily do handle, or
 receaue the Eucharist, with those men who
 killed *Christ*.

The third is taken from the change of
 bread; which mutation the Fathers seuerall
 wayes proueto be Reall. First they say, the
 bread doth not remayne after Consecra-
 tion. Secondly, that the Sense is deceaued
 therein. Thirdly, they compare the change
 here made with the reall mutations of *Water*
 into *Wine*, and of the *Wandes* of *Moyse*, into
Serpents. Fourthly, the Fathers affirme, that
 the Omnipotency of God is necessarily requi-
 red, to performe this mutation.

The fourth Head, is taken from the most
 high *Mystery* which the Fathers did ack-
 nowledg to be in the *Eucharist*; For first,
 they say it cannot be apprehended without
 faith. Secondly they did exhort Christians
 to an infallible constancy in beliefe of the
 truth of this mystery. Thirdly, they taught
 that the miracle therein exceeded mans ca-
 pacity.

pacify and apprehension. Fourthly the Fathers did forbear (in reuerence thereof) to speake of the Eucharist before *Heathens*, or those which were only *Catechumeni*, except couertly in these words, *Normus fideles*. Fifthly, they being demanded, how the mystery of the Eucharist could be performed, their answer was to refer it to the *Omnipotency* of God.

The fifth Branch is taken from the *Veneration and worship* given to the Eucharist; For first they did adore the Eucharist. Secondly, they did *invoke* it, or did say, that it was to be *inuoked*. Thirdly, they were most cautelous, that no part thereof should fall vpon the Earth. Fourthly, they would not suffer it to be seene of *Heathens*, or *Catechumeni*. Fifthly, they auerred, that *Angells* did stand neere vnto the *Altar*, whilst this Sacrifice is performed; yea Chrysostome plainly sayth, that Angells did stand in the presence of the Eucharist, *capite inclinato*, with bowing downe their Heades.

The sixt Classe is taken from the *Effects*, which the Fathers ascribe to the Eucharist. For first they teach, that by it we are corporally vnited with *Christ*. Secondly, they affirme, that our bodies are to suffer *Resurrection*, because they are vnited with the body of *Christ*. Thirdly Chrysostome sayth, that *Christ* doth giue himselfe in the Eucharist, that we may haue him truly within our selues: Euen as men do couet (yet cannot)

giue

give themselves to those, whom they love.
 Fourthly, the Fathers say, that when we re-
 ceave *Christ* in the Eucharist, *Christ* is ioy-
 ned with vs, not only by *Fayth and Charity*,
 but also *reipso*, in very deede. Fifthly, they
 teach, that by the perception or receaving
 of this Sacrament, we are made *Consortes di-
 vine nature: partakers of the Divine Nature*.
 Now if the Reader do desire to see the Fa-
 thers in particular, who affirme such and
 such points set downe in this *Animaduer-
 sion*, I refer him to the 39. Chapter of the se-
 cond booke de *Eucharistia*, in Bellarmine;
 from which place I do acknowledg, I haue
 taken this *Animadversion*. Now what can be
 replied against the Fathers Sentences he-
 rein? It cannot be said, that they deliuered
 these *Encomia* and lauds of the Blessed Sacra-
 ment, by way of *Rhetoricall amplification*,
exaggeration, or *Hyperbolicall speeches*; First,
 because not any one Father (among so ma-
 ny) doth but intimate any such manner of
 writing in their workes; Secondly, in that
 some of them, do write to the contrary af-
 firming that the sense of the words tou-
 ching the B. Sacrament are literally to be
 taken as they are written; for thus doth Hi-
 larius (by way of preuention, touching the
 Fathers meaning) write hereof: *Non est (m) (m) Hi-
 humano aut seculi sensu in Dei rebus loquen-
 dom: neque per violentam & impudentem prædi-
 cationem celestium dictorum sanitati alienæ, at-
 Trini-
 qui impie intelligentie extorquenda puerilitate.*

est. *Que scripta sunt legamus, & que legimus intelligamus, & tunc perfecte fidei officio fungamur: de naturali enim in nobis Christi veritate que dicimus, nisi ab eo discimus stultè atque impie dicimus; ipse enim ait, Caro mea verè est esca &c.* And thus much, touching this Father censuring of his owne writings, and of other Fathers also, concerning the Blessed Sacrament; and that the Sentences delivered of it, ought to be taken literally, and plainly, and not Hyperbolically, or figuratively, and as amplifications.

Animaduersion CXXIV.

AS aboue is shewed, that the auncient Fathers euen by the Confession of the Protestants, taught the Doctrine of *transubstantiation* in the *Eucharist*; so also in this *Animaduersion* I hold it conuenient, to discover the like iudgement of the Fathers, that the *Eucharist* is a true and *Real Sacrifice*, offered vnto God and this from the pennis of our Aduersaryes.

First thè, *Symmachus* was Bishop of Rome, (n) Cent. of whom the *Centurists* thus write (n): No. 6 cap. 10. *tas Antichristi &c. Symmachus had the Notes of col. 664. Antichrist, for he brought the Masse into a forme.*

Of *Ambrose* the *Centurists* thus confesse: (o) Cent. (o) *Ambrosius locutionibus vitatur, quibus ante 4. c. 4. eum ex patribus nemo usus est; ut Missam facere, col. 293. offerre Sacrificium: Ambrose doth use certaine speeches, the which no other Father before him*
did

id est; as to say Masse, so offer up Sacrifice &c.

The Councell of Carthage (whereat S. Austin was present) is in these words expressed by Pelargus, a Protestant; (p) *Hec Synodus Carthagenensis Intercessionem & Missam pro defunctis iniunxit*: This Synod of Carthage did ordaine intercession of prayers, and Masse for the Dead. (p) In his School la fidei tract. de Concil.

Cyrill of Jerusalem is thus taxed by Hospi- pag. 12.
nian the Protestant: (q) *Quoad Cyrillum Hierosolymitanum attinet &c.* Cyrill of Jerusalem (q) Hospi-
nianus
bist. 34.
saith indeed, according to the use of his tyme, & craves that the Sacrifice of the Altar is a great help to pag. 107.
soules. (r) L. de

Gregory Nyssene is thus charged by Cresso- episcopo
pian a Protestant: Nyssenus (r) *ille ait, Cum missa-
leris Christus discipulis suis corpus suum ad es-
comedendum &c. iam latenter, & ineffa-* (s) Cresso-
pianus
col. 33.
biliter, & invisibiliter Corpus immolatum erat &c. (t) Cen-
turius in
the Al-
He, When Christ came to his disciples his body to phabetti-
call Ta-
ble of the
third
Century
eat &c. that then his body was immolated and (u) Of-
sander
under
offered up latently, ineffably, and invisibly.

Cyprian, who lived an. 240. the Centurists the Al-
do thus reprehend: *Sacerdotem (s) Cyprianus* phabetti-
call Ta-
ble of the
third
Century
inquit, vice Christi fungi, & Deo patri Sacrifi-
cium offerri, and from hence they charge Cy-
prian with (t) Superstition.

Tertullian, who lived anno 220. Ofiander under
thus accuseth: *Tertullianus (u) approbanis oblationem pro defunctis*: Tertullian approved (u) Of-
sander
under
of Oblation for the Dead; Ofiander heere mea-
ning the oblation of the Sacrifice of the (u) Of-
sander
under
Masse. In further confirmation whereof we Cant. 13.

(x) D. *synd D. Fulk* thus to write: *Tertullian*, (x) *Cyprian*, *Austin*, *Ierome*, and a great many more do witnesse, that *Sacrifice for the Dead*, is a Tradition of the Apostles.

Irenaeus in like manner, who liued anno 170. is charged by the *Centurists*, who thus wryte of him: *De (y) oblatione Irenaeus* (l. 4. c. 23.) *satis videtur loqui incommode*, &c. *Irenaeus* in l. 4. c. 23. seemeth to speake inconveniently inough of Oblation, or Sacrifice, when he saith: That *Christ* had taught a new oblation of the new Testament; the which the Church receiving from the Apostles; offered to God throughout the whole world; Thus far the *Centurists* of this father.

Ignatius (the Apostles schollar) who liued anno 90. is thus censured by the *Centurists*: (a) *Cent.* (x) *Quaedam ambigua, & incommode dicta in quibusdam occurrunt, ut in Epistola Ignatii ad Smirnaenses: Non licet (inquit Ignatius) sine Episcopo neque offerre, neque Sacrificium immolare*: There are certaine doubtfull and inconvenient sayings, which do occurre in diuers place,

as in *Ignatius* his Epistle ad *Smirnaenses*: where *Ignatius* sayth: It is not lawfull without a Bishop to immolate, or offer up Sacrifice; Which very words of *Ignatius* the *Centurists* in another place affirme to be, (a) *periculosa, & quasi errorum semina*. Thus farre of the Fathers Doctrine touching the Sacrifice of the Masse; a Poynt so euident, that *Caluin* insinuateth all the Fathers within this reprehension: saying, The fathers did (b) *adul-*

(a) *Cent.* 2. c. 30. col. 107. (b) *Calu.* in omnes *Pauli Ep.* in *Hebr.* 2. 7. pag. 714.

erare the supper of our Lord, by adding Sacri-
fice unto it. With whom (to omit some o-
thers) *Sebastianus Francus* thus recordeth :

(c) *Statim post Apostolos omnia inueterata sunt* (c) *In*
Ec. Cena Domini in Sacrificium transformata *Epist. de*
abrogan-
dis in v-
niuersum
omnibus
statuta
Eccle-
siast.
To the Antiquity of the Doctrine of the
Masse and Sacrifice, I will subnect the con-
sideration of the Vniuersality of the Do-
ctrine thereof, practized both in former
tymes, and at this present day, by all the
Christians of the whole world (our Aduer-
saries only excepted.) For the Christians in
Asia, Affrike, Europe, yea the *Grecians, Arme-*
nians, the far distant *Ethiopians*, and the re-
mote *Orientall Indians* (of whom many
neuer heard of the Roman Church) in their
daly recourse of Pilgrimage to *Ierusalem*, do
ever conspire and agree together (as it hath
beene, and is obserued by Trauellers) in
the Doctrine of the *Real Presence*, and daly
practise of saying, and offering vp the holy
Sacrifice of the *Masse*, notwithstanding
their knowne diuersity of opinions in o-
ther matters.

Animaduerſion CXXV.

THE Greeke text in Luk. 22. viz. *οὗτο ἐστὶν ὁ*
καλὸς τοῦ αἵματος διαθήκης ἐν ᾧ ἀμύναται ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὁ
αἵματι τοῦ αἵματος: *Hic calix nouum testamentum*
in sanguine meo, qui (viz. Calix) pro vobis ef-
funditur. This Text (I say) by force of the
Greeke, in regard, that the *Relative* in the
Greeke, agreeth with *Calix*, and not with :

San-

(2) D. synd D. Fawks thus to write: *Tertullian*, (2) *Cyprian*, *Austin*, *Ierome*, and a great many more do witnesse, that Sacrifice for the Dead, is a Tradition of the Apostles.

Irenaeus in like manner, who liued anno 170. is charged by the *Centurists*, who thus wryte of him: *De (y) oblatione Irenaeus* (l. 4. c. 23.) *satis videtur loqui incommode*, &c. *Irenaeus* in l. 4. c. 23. seemeth to speake inconveniently inough of Oblation, or Sacrifice, when he saith: That Christ had taught a new oblation of the new Testament; the which the Church receauing from the Apostles; offered to God throughout the whole world; Thus far the *Centurists* of this father.

Ignatius (the Apostles schollar) who liued anno 90. is thus censured by the *Centurists*: (2) *Quedam ambigua, & incommode dicta in quibusdam occurrunt, ut in Epistola Ignatii ad Smirnaenses: Non licet (inquit Ignatius) sine Episcopo neque offerre, neque Sacrificium immolare*; There are certaine doubtfull and inconvenient sayings, which do occurre in diuers place, as in *Ignatius* his Epistle ad *Smirnaenses*: where *Ignatius* sayth: It is not lawfull without a Bishop to immolate, or offer up Sacrifice; Which very words of *Ignatius* the *Centurists* in another place affirme to be, (a) *periculosa, & quasi errorum semina*. Thus farre of the Fathers Doctrine touching the Sacrifice of the Masse; a Poynt so euident, that *Caluin* imitateth all the Fathers within this reprehension: saying, The fathers did (b) *adul-*

(a) *Cens.* 2. c. 30. col. 107. (b) *Calu.* in omnes *Pauli Ep.* in *Hebr.* 2. 7. pag. 224. *terate*

terate the supper of our Lord, by adding Sacri-
fice unto it. With whom (to omit some o-
thers) *Sebastianus Francus* thus recordeth :

(c) *Statim post Apostolos omnia inueterata sunt* (c) In
Ec. Cama Domini in Sacrificium transformata Epist. de
 est. To the Antiquity of the Doctrine of the abrogan-
 Masse and Sacrifice, I will subnect the con- dis in v-
 sideration of the Vniuersality of the Do- niuersum
 ctrine thereof, practized both in former omnibus
 tymes, and at this present day, by all the statutis
 Christians of the whole world (our Aduer- Eccle-
 saries only excepted.) For the Christians in siat.
 Asia, Affrike, Europe, yea the *Grecians*, *Arme-
 nians*, the far distant *Ethiopians*, and the re-
 mote *Oriental Indians* (of whom many
 neuer heard of the Roman Church) in their
 daly recourse of Pilgrimage to *Ierusalem*, do
 euer conspire and agree together (as it hath
 beene, and is obserued by Trauellers) in
 the Doctrine of the *Real Presence*, and daly
 practise of saying, and offering vp the holy
 Sacrifice of the Masse, notwithstanding
 their knowne diuersity of opinions in o-
 ther matters.

Animaduersion CXXV.

THE Greeke text in Luk. 22. viz. *οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ
 κύπελλον τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καινοῦ διαθήκης
 ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*: Hic calix nouum testamentum
 in sanguine meo, qui (viz. Calix) pro vobis of-
 funditur. This Text (I say) by force of the
 Greeke, in regard that the *Relative* in the
 Greeke, agreeth with *Calix*, and not with :

San-

Sanguine, sheweth that *Calix* was shed for vs. Now seeing that *Calix* (taken Materially) could not be shed for vs; therefore that, which was containd in the *Calix*, was shed for vs: But *Wine* could not be shed for mans redemption; therefore it inauoydably followeth, that the *bloud of Christ* was in the *Calix*. This testimony (by reason of the greeke words so exprest) is so forcible and conuincing to proue, that bloud

(d) *Beza* was in the *Cup*, that *Beza* (d) seeing it could be no waye otherwyse answered, said: *these greeke words were surreptions, creeping by negligence out of the Margent into the Text*, though it hath euer beene read (as now we read it) in all auncient Greeke Manuscripts.

Animaduersion CXXVI.

Whereas our Aduersaryes to proue, that the verbe *Est*, in the words of Consecration, should be taken for *significat*, (so excluding thereby all *reall Presence*) do vrgemany Texts of Scripture, in which they say, the said word *Est*, must of necessity be taken for *significat*: as *Agnus est Pascha*, *Exod*; 12. *Septem boues sunt septem anni*, *Genes*. 14. *Ego sum Osium*, *Joan*. 20. and some others. To this I answere, First, that in *Parables* and *similitudes*, the verb *Est* is taken for *significat*, and yet without any Trope: The reason hereof being, because the whole essence of all such things is placed in *signification*.

eration. Secondly, I answere, that in the examples alledged by our Aduersaryes, there immediatly followeth an explication of the Trope, and figure; but of the words of the *Justitition* there followeth no explication. Thirdly, in most of the examples alledged by our Aduersaryes, euer *predicatur disparatum de disparato*, as *Christus est Osium*, my meaning is, that, that which is of a most different Nature is said of another thing of the like different Nature; which kynd of propositions, seeing they cannot be by any meanes properly & literally true, we are forced to expound the same by Tropes and figures: But in the words *Hoc est Corpus meum*, there is no such kind of strāge & vnusuall predication, at least in the appearance of the words themselues.

Animaduersion C X X V I I.

I do much wonder, that any of our learned Aduersaryes (as often they do) insist in those words against the Reall presence. *Spiritus est, qui uinificat; Caro non prodest.* Joan. 6. It is the spirit which quickneth, the flesh profiteth not. For heere the literall sense of these words only is, that a Carnall vnderstanding of spirituall things, doth not profit, as (e) Cyprian, Chrysostome (f), and Origen (g) do expound. But admit that Christ did speake of his flesh; yet it proueth nothing against his being in the *Eucharist*; both because by the same Reason, we may conclude,

(e) *Serm. de Cena Domini.*

(f) *Vpon this place.*

(g) *L. 1. in Epist. ad*

Rom.

clude, that the bread is not in the Sacrament for if the *body of Christ* profiteth vs nothing, much lesse can a litle peece of wheaten bread profit vs. Againe if our Lord had spoken of his flesh, he would not haue vnderstood it absolutely; but only that the *flesh* without the *Spirit* profiteth nothing; Since otherwise our Lord should haue crossed himselfe, who said: *Qui manducat carnem meam, habet vitam eternam*. Lastly, it is no lesse, then a great impiety to deny, that the flesh of *Christ* (being vnited with his *Divinity*) profiteth vs nothing; Seeing *S. Paul*, *Coloss. 1.* attributes all our Saluation to the *flesh of Christ*; for he saith, *that we are reconciled to God by the said flesh.*

Animaduerſion CXXVIII.

Whereas our Aduersaries in further impugning of the *reall Presence* do obiect, first the Indignity proffered by vs to *Christ* his body, in mantayning it to be really in the *Eucharist*, since by this reason, say they, it may become rotten and mouldy, and be eaten by myce, & should passe to the belly, and so to the common passage. To this I answer, that these supposed indignities do not touch the body of *Christ*, but only affect the *species*, and *forms* of the *Eucharist*, which is ioyned with the body. Againe, seeing our Christian sayth teacheth vs, that *Christ* was included for a long tyme within the Wombe of the *Blessed Virgin*, being a Woman;

Woman; that he was swadled, and lapped in
Cloaths, that then he might fall vpon the
earth, and might also haue beene eaten with
beasts, or burnt (if so by miracle he were
not preserued from such mischances) if rhe
he was truly, and in his owne person subiect
to all these difficultyes, without any disho-
nour; what dishonour is it to him, if he did
vndergo (in another forme) the former
supposed Indecencies, vrged by our Ad-
uersariyes? Againe, the former Indignities
do no more truly, and properly touch the
body of *Christ*, then the *Divinity*; which
(being in all places) can be said to be burnt,
it being in the fyre, or being rotten, it be-
ing in bodyes that are rotten &c.

Animaduersion CXXIX.

O Vr Aduersaries draw another argument,
taken from the vnprofitableness of the
Reall Presence in the *Eucharist*. Thus they
dispute; The reall being of *Christs* body in
the *Eucharist*, is needles, in that seeing the
end and fruite of the *Eucharist* is to nou-
rish the Soule; and this nourishment consi-
sting in fayth and Charity, may as auaylea-
bly be performed by apprehending *Christ*
by fayth, as he is only in Heauen; it there-
fore followeth, that no profit aryseth from
the Catholike doctrine herein, which is not
by other meanes as well effected. To this I
answere, first, that it is false to say, that the
same fruite is reaped by *Christ* in Heauen,

as by receauing him really into our bodies, since Experience doth witnesse, that by this receauing him in the *Eucharist*, our *Faith*, *Charity*, *Denotion*, and *Reuerence* are more encreased: Besides, our reall coniunction with *Christ* affordeth many benefits to the soule, which *Christ* giueth not without this Coniunction; no otherwise, then he cured all such, who touched the *Hemme of his garment*, whom he would not haue cured (though otherwise he could) if they had not touched it. Secondly, I affirme; It is a false illustration to conelude, It was not conuenient, that *Christ* should be really in the *Eucharist*, because the fruite reaped thereby, may be obtained by other meanes; For that is profitable, which doth confer any Good, though the same good may be obtayned otherwise. For one drop of *Christs* blood, or any other laborious worke vndertaken by him for our good, had beene sufficient for our Redemption; yet it followeth not, that all his paines, labours, effusion of blood, yea death it selfe, were vnprofitably and bootelesly performed. Yea *God* could haue redeemed the world without the *Incarnation of Christ*; shall we therefore say, that the *Incarnation of Christ* was needles, inconuenient, and vnprofitable?

Animaduersion CXXX.

W Hereas aboue there haue beene alleged diuers testimonies out of the *law* and

and ancient *Rabins*, in prooffe of diuerse Articles of our Roman Catholike fayth, & particularly of the Sacrifice, which the *Rabins* say, the *Messias* shall make at his coming; our Aduersaries seeke to euade the force of all the *Iewish Rabins* authorities, by saying, that those testimonies of the *Rabins* were first forged by *Galatinus*, and fathered vpon the *Iewes* for their greater credit. And according hereto we find *D. Whitaker* thus to answer *Dureus*, who vrged some *Iewish* sentences out of *Galatinus*, for prooffe of the *Agall* Presence, and Sacrifice: *Tuum (h) in hac causa Petrum Galatinum minime profecto desideramus, nec Hebreorum testimonij illis indigemus.* Now to free *Galatinus* from suspicion of forging all such sentences of the *Rabins* in fauour of Christianity, and of Articles of our Roman Religion; I answer hereto, and say, that one *Hieronymus de Sancta fide*, being a *Iew*, and conuerted to Christianity in the tyme before *Galatinus* (whose Physician he was) did write a booke entituling it: *Hebreo-matrix, or vindex impietatis, & perfidie Iudaice*, wherein he proueth diuers points of Christianity from the there alledged testimonies and sentences of the said former *Iewes*, mentioned by *Galatinus*. This booke of his was printed at *Frankford* anno 1603.

Animaduerſion CXXXI.

[T]is much obserued, how our Aduersaries in answering to Catholike Bookes,
P often

often giue slip to the argument, or authority produced; and in lieu thereof either by degrees flye to the state of the Question (as though afore it were not acknowledged) or to the Scripture (themselves only interpreting the same) where they may range vp and downe at large; or to some by-circumstance, meerely accessory to the Question and difficulty disputed of; or do vie deceytfull resemblance, and exchange of matter, subtilly conueyed, and brought in by tedious entertainment of prolonged discourse; and all this to hold the Reader therewith, that so vnespiedly they may diuert the Readers eye and memory (being thus fixed vpon their digressions) from the authority and reason alledged. Here also may alledge their accustomed practice in printing the Catholikes Books at large, & their answer conioyned thereto in the same bulke or volume; Their vsuall imposture then is, to cause the Catholike authors words to be set downe in a most little, obscure, and darke letter or Character, thereby to withdraw the Readers eye from perusing and reading it at large; whereas their answer thereto, they procure to be printed in a fayre and great Character or letter, that so they may more easely inuite the Reader to the full perusing of it. And this sleight is particularly (belides in others) manifested in *D. Whitakers* Answer to *B. Father Campan his ten Reasons*, in his Challenge to the

two Volumes; also in D. White his Booke
against his Aduersaries entituled: *The way to
the true Church.*

Animaduerſion CXXXII.

IF many miracles were wrought concer-
ning *Christs* body, before, and whiles he
were conuerſed vpon earth; may not then a
man be more eaſily induced to belieue the (i) To
great Miracle of his body in the Inſtitution *Wis, du-*
of the *Eucharist*? A litle before the *Natiuitie* ring
thereof, we reade: (*Concepſus eſt de Spiritu Chriſti*
Santo; At the very inſtant of his birth: *Na-* faſt of
ſtaſta Maria Virgine: ſome ſmall tyme af- forty
ter his death: *Tertia die reſurrexit*; vpon his laſt *days.*
ſeparate from vs: Aſcendit ad Celos; In all (k) *Whē*
which paſſages *Nature* herſelfe was (if not *he did*
diſſolved), at leaſt ſuſpended: yea whiles he *ate with*
were conuerſed vpon earth, the ſame ſacred *his Apo-*
body of *Chriſt* was ſometimes nourished *ſtes after*
without (i) eating, at other tymes did eate *his Re-*
without (k) any nourishment thereby: fur- *ſurre-*
thermore, the ſame body remayning *Viſible*, (l) *Ac-*
(i) became *Inuiſible*: To conclude, *Chriſt* bleſ- *cording*
ed body did walke (m) moſt firmly vpon *to Luc.*
the liquid Element, ſo as the vnſtable Wa- *4. Ipſe*
ter did then ſupport him who ſupports the *transiens*
heavens: Yf then *Nature* did ſo often ſub- *per me-*
ſtand humble herſelfe to this ſacred bo- *dum il-*
dy, how can we Chriſtians doubt of the in- *lorum*
dubitable certainty of thoſe words of *Chriſt* *ibat.*
concerning his body, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, (m) *Maſ.*
proceeding from our true and powerfull 14.

Lord; since *Truth* acknowledgeth not *Truth*, nor *Omnipotency* Deficiency?

Animaduerſion CXXXIII.

Touching the doctrine of *Freewill*, I have thought good to ſet downe theſe few *Animaduerſions* following, eſpecially for the uſe of ſuch as are ſcollars. Here then we are to know, that *liberum arbitrium*, or *Freewill*, is not only a *paſſive power*, neither partly *paſſive*; nor partly *aſſive*, but is ſimply and only an *Aſſive power*. Secondly; by *Freewill* no things *Euill*, but only things *Good* are deſired. For the proper obieſt of the *Will* is that which is *good*, or at leaſt that, which is apprehended vnder the ſhew of *Good*. Not that which is *euill* doth not belong to the obieſt of the *will*, but only ſecondarily, *per accidens*, ſo far forth, as we wiſh that, which is *Euill*; and therefore we will not, becauſe *Euill*, is contrary to the good which properly we will. Thirdly, *Freewill* hath reference as well to things *Preſent*, as to things to come. The truth of which *Theſis* is thus proued: Yf *Freewill* could not conſiſt touching things that are preſent, then would it follow, that *God* ſhould not be in his Actions truly free; the reaſon is becauſe to *God* nothing is paſt, nor nothing to come, but all things are preſent. Fourthly, the obieſt of *Freewill*, is not the *End*, but only the *meanes* to the *End*. Hence we ſpeake of the chiefe Act of the *Will*, which

is *Efficient*, where the Freedome of the Will doth respect only the *Mediū*, but not the *Finis*. And it may be said to respect the *End*, only, as the *End* may *inducere rationem mediij*, vndergoe the shew or forme of the *meanes*. Fifthly, the Subiect of *Free will* cannot be any thing, but an *Intelligent Nature*, that is, nothing is endued with *Free will*, which hath not intelligeney & vnderstanding. And hence it is, that Beasts cannot be said to haue free-will, because they haue their iudgement determined by Nature, against the which they cannot *reluctari*, or strue, and they cannot conferre one thing with another, which is the foundation of *free will*: And thereupon it riseth, that all Beasts of the same kind do euer worke after one and the same manner. Sixtly, it is to be obserued, that there is a double freedome of Nature, for there is a *freedome*, which is opposed to a *simple coercion*, and constraint; and those things are said to be freely donne, frō this simple constraint, the which though necessarily they be donne, and cannot be but donne, yet they are freely and voluntarily done; according hereto we ali will, & wish to be happy, and cannot in any sort will to be vnhappy. There is also a freedome or liberty of the will, to the which not only *coercion*, but also *necessity* is repugnant: And those actions are said to be free from necessity, the which we can will, or not will: as when we do walke, or speake, we might

notwithstanding have not walked, or have beene silent. Now the freedome of will, which the Catholike doctrine requireth, is a freedome from necessity, and not only a freedome from coercion, or constraint.

Animaduerſion C X X X I V.

(a) *Gregorius
Arminius.
Scotus,
Gabriel,
and others, in
ſecond.
Sentent.
diſtinct.
37.*

O V R Aduerſaries hold it impoſſible, that *Liberrum Arbitrium* can ſtand with the *Di-
vine Operation*; affirming, that the Coope-
ration of God doth take away, and deſtroy
the Freedome of will. But the Catholike
Schoole Deuynes (n) do mantayne, that
they both may ſtand together, and they ex-
plicate it in this ſort: They teach, that the
Cooperation of God in any worke perfor-
med by Man with *Freedome* of will, beareth
it ſelfe with reference to the *Effect*, not with
reference to the *Cauſe*, that is, that the con-
course of God doth not determinate our
Will, neither doth worke, or imprint any
thing vpon it, but that it immediately flowes
into the *Effect*, and doth produce the ſame
in the very ſame moment, in the which it is
produced by the *Will*. And hence ſay they,
it followeth, that God doth neither deter-
minate, or neceſſitate the *Will*, nor the *Will*
God, ſince both giue freely their concurrence,
and if the one will not concurre, the Action
will not be done: Euen as (ſay they) when
two men do beare a great ſtone, the which
the one of them is not able to beare, neither
of theſe men do add force to the other, or
impell

impell the one the other, and it is in the liberty of either of them to leaue the burden: Although *God* (except he would extraordinarily worke some miracle) doth euer concur, when our *Will* doth concur, because he hath in a certaine manner bound himself thereto, when he did create mans *Free Will*. From which it followeth, that though *God*, and Mans *Will*, euen in the same moment of tyme do begin to worke; yet *God* worketh, because the *Will* worketh, not contrariwise.

Animaduerſion CXXXV.

Ov^r Aduerſaries for the impugning of *Free Will* ſay, that it deſtroyeth *Gods Preſcience*, or foreknowledg, ſeing both theſe, I meane mans *Free Will*, and *Gods foreknowledg* cannot ſtand together: for *God* doth foreknow all future things neceſſarily, and it cannot poſſibly be, that *God* ſhould be deſtroyed; therefore all things haue their euent out of a certaine Neceſſity. I anſwere hereto, that the *Preſcience* of *God* is moſt certaine, yet doth it not impoſe any neceſſity to things future. This is thus proued, according to the iudgment of *S. Auſtin* (o) (o) *Au.* and others: Yf the foreknowledg of *God* doth *Am. l. 3.* impoſe a Neceſſity to future things, the rea-*de libero* ſon hereof ſhould be taken from *Preſcience* *Arbi-* or foreknowledg, as it is conſidered in it ſelf, or els from *Preſcience*, as it is the *Pre-* ſcience of *God*: But neither of theſe are true.

For first if *Prescience* of God (because it is *Prescience*) should impose a necessity to future things, then it would follow, that not only the *Prescience* of God, but also the *Prescience* of Man, should in like manner impose a necessity to future things. But this is false: for the foreknowledge of man is not the cause of things, neither doth it worke any things that are future. For example, if by diuine reuelation I should know, that it will raine to morrow; neuertheless I should not be the cause of the rayne, and yet without doubt it would rayne, but no lesse contingently, then if I had knowne nothing thereof. Now, why those things which certainly are foreknowne, do euer haue their Euent, when as notwithstanding they come to passe contingently, and in respect hereof may not come to passe; the cause hereof is; Because who foreseeth a thing to come, doth in his vnderstanding anticipate, and preuent the effecting & doing of the same thing, and so behouldeth the thing already done, before it be done, but that which is donne, cannot be vndone, though it be done freely, and contingently. Therefore it may be concluded, that the *Prescience* of God imposeth not a necessity to things, as *foresight*, or *foreknowledge* is considered in it selfe; neither as it is considered to be the *Prescience* of God. This is proued, for as God doth foresee what men will do, so he also foreseeth, what himselfe

will

will doe; but the *Prescience* of God doth not force God, that he will worke; or do any thing; therefore by the same reason his *Prescience* doth not force men. In like manner the Protestants obiekt, that *Gratia efficax* (which we Catholikes do grant, that it is giuen to diuers men) doth destroy *Freewill*. To this I answer with *S. Austin*, that this *Gratia efficax* hath indeed an infallible certitude, but yet hath no necessitude, but only *ex hypothesi*; and in this respect, it doth not hinder the *Freedom* of mans Will: for, though certaine it is, that this *Gratia efficax* will not be reiected; yet it is as certaine, that it may be reiected. And therefore this *efficacious grace*, where it is giuen, doth no more induce a necessity, or hinder the *Freedom* of the will, then the *Prescience*, or foreknowledge of God doth.

Animaduersion CXXXVI.

SOME of our Aduersaries (and particularly *Luther*, as is aboue said) do thus write: *The ten* (p) *Commandements* appertaine to Christians: And againe: *The ten* (q) *Commandements* were giuen vs, not to do them, but to know our Damnation, and to call for Mercy: And yet more plainly *D. Willet* writeth: *The Law* remaineth still impossible to be kept by vs, through the weaknes of our flesh; *Number* (r) doth God giue vs ability to keepe it, notwithstanding *Christ* hath fulfilled it for vs. Thus these pismen seeke to free vs from keeping the *Com-*
mande-
ments.

(s) *Luth.*
rom. 8.
Witten-
berg, de
captivis.
Babylon.
fol. 74.

mandements, because (say they) Christ hath kept them for vs. And may not any man conclude from the same ground, that we Christians are not bound to pray at any tyme, or to practise Vertue and Piety, because Christ hath prayed for vs all, and liued a most holy life, for vs all? Such incutiues to all vice, and turpitude in conuersation doth this doctrine beget in the believers thereof; and therefore the little wonder, that we find *Luther* thus to write: (s) *Christian man is so rich, that although in world, he cannot loose his Salvation, by any means, how great soener, vntlesse he will not believe.*

Animaduerſion CXXXVII.

IN setting downe the necessity of the euer *visibillity* of Christs Church, I will not so much insist in the Scriptures, or in the authority of the Fathers confirming the same, as in the true and ingenious acknowledgment of the learned Protestants thereof; which being here once expressed, then I will draw a most dangerous and irrepleable inference, to the mayne ouerthrow of the Protestants Church. Well then to begin
 (t) *In H.*
l. 4. c. 2.
Scct. 4.
 (u) *In his*
Treatise
of Free-
Will. pa.
92,
visibili Ecclesia &c. Extra cains gremium non
speranda peccatorum remissio: Out of whose bo-
some we cannot expect any remission of sinne.
Hannius giueth his sentence in these words
God (u) in all times hath placed his Church in a

place, and hath exalted it in the sight of all
 people and Nations. Iacobus Andrews, that fa-
 mous Protestant: We (x) are not ignorant, that (x) In his
 the Church must be a visible Company of teachers, books &
 and bearers. Melancthon is most luxuriant in gainst
 his Sentences of this point, who thus wri-
 teth: Necesse (y) est fateri esse visibilem Ecclē. pag. 110.
 &c. It is necessary to confesse the Church to (y) Me-
 be visible. Whither tendeth then, hac portentosa lamē. in
 ratio, this monstrous Opinion, which denieth Concil.
 the Church to be visible? And in another place Theologi
 this Protestant thus further discourseth: ars. 2.
 Whensomever (z) we thinke of the Church, let vs (z) In
 behold the Company of such men, as are gather- loc. com.
 ed together, which is the visible Church: neither dis. 1364.
 let vs dream, that the Elect of God are to be c. de Be-
 found in any other place, then in this visible So- cū.
 ciety &c. Neither let vs imagine of any other in-
 visible Church. Briefly the said Melancthon,
 urging severall texts of Scripture in prooffe (a) Me-
 of the Churches visibility, sayth: (a) Hi & si- laud.
 miler loci &c. these and such like places of Scrip- ubi su-
 ture. Non de idem Platonica, sed de Ecclesiis visi- pra.
 bili loquuntur. (b) Lib.
 D. Field thus writeth: The (b) Persons, of whō 1. of the
 the Church consisteth, are visible, their profession Church.
 known even unto the prophane &c. I will con- c. 20. pag.
 clude with D. Hamfrey, thus teaching: Car (c) (c) D.
 curio & curiosē probant, quod est a nobis nūm- Hamfrey
 quam negatum? Why do the Papists so pathetically in his la-
 jecty to prove thus, which we never denyed? And suitif.
 then after he sayth: Non enim clauiculary so- pars. 2.
 luti; & conuocationes sunt Christianae: The Sa. cap. 11
 cū

ciety of Christians are not secret meetings. And then there speaking of the Church militant he further thus sayth : *Oportet Ecclesiam esse conspicuam, Conclusio est clarissima: It is a manifest Conclusion, that the Church is to be conspicuous, and visible.* Thus far of the learned Protestants confessing the truth, touching the euer necessary and vninterrupted visibility of the Church of Christ. Now the Deduction, which I draw from the premisses is this : That seeing the Church of Christ must euer be conspicuous and visible; And further, seeing that the Protestant Church hath beene wholly latent and inuisible (according to the iudgment of some Protestants) for the space of this last thousand yeares; but by the acknowledgment of other learned Protestants during these last thirteene or foureteene hundred yeares, as aboue I haue set downe in our Aduersaries literall authorities and sentences, acknowledging so much; what other thing then can result out of our Aduersaries owne positions, but that the Protestant Church, through want of a necessary, and vninterrupted visibility, is not the true Church of Christ?

Animaduersion CXXXVIII.

THAT *Luther* was an Enemy to the Divinity of Christ, and the Blessed Trinity, is aboue shewed. In this Animaduersion, *Caluin* shall be charged with the like impiety. This I
 prout,

tione, in that *Calvin* labours to auoyde
 detort all such chiefe places of sacred writ,
 in the Ancient Fathers were accustomed to
 alledge in prooffe of *Christ's* Diminity. Now
 first, I will set downe his owne words a-
 gainst the B. Trinity, whereof he thus sayth:
Her (d) precatio, Sancta Trinitas, vnus Deus,
miserere nostri, mihi non placet, & barbaricum (d) In
minio sapit; This prayer, Holy Trinity, one God, Ep. 1. ad
hanc mercy vpon vs, doth not please me for it ta- Polonos
steth of Barbarism. Now to come to the text in tract.
 impoysoned by his Constructions: and first Theolog.
 that remarkable passage, *I, and (e) the Father* P 796.
et vnus, vz. one thing, euer mainly insisted (e) Ioan.
 vpon by the Ancient (f) Fathers, against the (f) Chry-
 Ariant; for prooffe of the Diminity of *Christ*; soe, in
 is thus auoyded by *Calvin*: (g) *Abusi sunt hoc* bunc la-
loco Vcteres, ut probarent Christum esse Patrem cum,
Homonion; neque enim Christus de unitate sub- Auslin
stantie disputat, sed de consensu: The ancient in hunc
 Fathers haue abused this place, to proue, that (i) Ioan. &
Christ is Consubstantiall to his Father; For many
Christ here disputeth not of the vnyty of Es- others.
 sence, but of the vnyty of Consent and will. A- (g) Cal-
 gaine, that passage: There (b) be three, that uin in
 gine testimony in Heauen, the Father, the Word, Ioan. ca
 and the Holy Ghost; and these three be one: 10.
 Which text the ancient Fathers euer ex- (h) r.
 pounded of the Trinity, *Calvin* thus answe- Ioan. 5.
 reth: *Quod (i) dicitur tres esse vnus, ad essen-* (i) Cal-
tiam non refertur, sed ad consensum potius: bunc lo-
 That is, where it is said, these three are One, bunc lo-
 these words are not to be referred to One, in ref-
 pect

ped of Essence, but rather of Consens. In like

(k) Psal. manner that place: Thou (k) art my Son
(hodie) this day I have begotten thee, Calvin

(l) In (l) interpreteth with the Arians against the
Psal. 2. Divinity of Christ. This point, I meane of

Calvin interpreting the chiefe passages of
Scripture (ever vrged by the Ancient Fa-
thers for proove of Christs Divinity) with the
Arians to impugn Christs Divinity, is so
e'eere and confessed, as that *Regidius Hun-
nius* (a most markable and learned Prote-
stant) writeth a booke against Calvin of this
subiect, thus entituling it: *Calvinus Indai-
zans, hoc est, Indaice glossa & corruptela, qui-
bus Joannes Calvinus illustrissima scriptura sa-
cra loco, & testimonia de gloriosa Trinitate &c.
detestandum in modum corrumpere non exhor-*

(m) In *Throlog.* rais. With this blasphemey against the Bles-
Calvinist. sed Trinity, Calvin is further charged by
2. fol. Conradus (m) *Schlossburg*, by (n) *Pelargus*, by
38. 10. & *Stancarus*, (o) and lastly by *Joannes Ma-
thens* alle eminent Protestants; which *Ma-
thens* did write a booke against Calvin, for
frequent. teaching *Arianisme* styling it: *de Cavendo
(n) In his* Calvinistarum sermonis &c.
Admo-
nitis, de
Arianis.

(o) *Stan-*
karus

contra
ministros
Gen-
uens. &
Tyguri-
ens.

Animaduerſion CXXXIX.

FROM the confessed Inmisibility of the Pro-
testant Church, during so many ages above
granted, it is proued, that the Protestant
Church is not the true Church of Christ by
this Medium following: The Prophetes do
fore ſhew, that the Church of Christ in the

ty me

tyme of the New testament, shall convert to
 its faith, the Gentils, their Nations, and
 kingdomes; thus accordingly we read *Eſay*
 to foretell of the Church: (p) *The ſles ſhall* (p) *Eſay*
waite for thee (meaning the Church:) *Their kings* c. 60. *vide*
shall miniſter vnto thee; and thy Gates ſhall be *ſtium*
continually open; neither day nor night ſhall they cap. 34.
be ſhut, that men may bring to thee the riches of
the Gentils; with whom accordeth the Roiall
Prophet ſpeaking in the periõ of the Church:
 (q) *I will give thee the Heathens for thy inheri-* (q) *Pſal.*
tance, and the ends of the earth for thy poſſeſſion. a.
 That theſe places of Scripture (beſydes di-
 uers others) are vnderſtood of the enlar-
 gement of *Chriſts Church*, and the cõuerſions
 of kingdomes and nations vnto it; is war-
 ranted by the acknowledgement of (r) *O-* (r) *Oco-*
colampodius (s), *D. Whitniſt*, *D. Whitaker* (r), *lawp. v-*
and others, as alſo by the Annotations of theſe *from lxx.*
Proteſtants owne English (u) *Bibles.* Now for *my.*
 prooſe that the Proteſtant Church neuer
 yet conuerted any Gentils, or Heathen King-
 domes and Nations to its fayth, we will be-
 gin firſt from *Luthers* tyme, and ſo aſcend
 by degrees vp to the *Apoſtles*. And firſt from
Luthers days to *Gregory the Great*, or *Boniſace*
the third, (which contayneth a thouſand
 yeares) it is euident, that during all this
 tyme the Proteſtant Church remained who-
 ly *innocent* (as is aboue demonſtrated, from
 the acknowledgments of Proteſtants) and
 therefore could not convert any Countreyes
 or Kingdomes to its religion. Againe tou-
 ching

(r) *Oco-*
colampodius
 (s) *D. Whitniſt*
 (r) *D. Whitaker*
 (r) *lawp. v-*
 (r) *from lxx.*
 (u) *my.*
 (s) *In his*
 deſcript.
 p. 406.
 (r) *In his*
 anſwere
 to M.
Williſons
Reynolds
 (u) *From*
 ted in the
 yeare
 1570.

(x) *Cent.*
8. 9. 10.
11. 12. 13.
14. 15.

ching all these Countreyes here expressed, to wit, *The Danes*, (x) *Moravians*, *Polonians*, *Slavonians*, *Bulgars*, *Hungars*, *Normans*, *Bavarians*, *Normegians*, *Saxons*, *Germans*, and divers others here omitted; the Conversions of all these happened within this last thousand yeares, and therefore were converted by the Church of Rome, and to the present Roman sayth, even by free acknowledgment of the *Magdeburgians*, or *Centurists*, according as the Bishops of Rome lived within those severall ages. Neither can our Aduersaries name any one Heathen Countrey in Christendome, converted to Christianity by the Protestant Church. And hence it riseth, that *D. Whitaker* doth stile the Conversion of all the former Countreyes, (as granting them to be converted to our present Roman sayth) *impure*, (y) and *corrupt Conversions*. Now to ascend from these last thousand yeares upwards to the other next three hundred yeares; I meane to the dayes of the first Christian Emperour; during the space of which three hundred yeares, no Countreyes or Kingdomes were converted at all to Christian Religion, either by Catholikes, or any others; for it is evident that in those daies there were no Kings professing the Christian Religion; the Emperours of the East only excepted; among whom some were false (z) Christians; as being defiled with *Arianisme*, others (a) *Apostatates*. Now concerning the tyme it selfe

(y) *Whitaker*
de Eccles.
contra Bellarm.
§. 336.

(z) *As Valens,*
Constantinus,
Maximianus,
et alii.

of *Constantine*, it is so certaine, that neither himself, nor any Country by his meanes was conuerted to the Protestant Religion, as that the *Magdeburgenses* (all Protestants) recording the state of the Church in *Constantines* tyme, do charge *Constantine* with all our Catholike points, at this day professed by the Church of Rome, styling them: *The (b) Errors of Constantine, and of his Age. (b) Cent.*

Now to ryle higher in tymes, to wit, 4. from the tymes of *Constantine* to that of *Christ* our *Sauionr*, it is witnessed by all Historiographers, that the Church of God was in such violent Persecutions, as that it had no meanes to enlarge it selfe by conuerting to it Kings, or Kingdomes; and if it had at that tyme conuerted any, yet the Question would then follow, whether such a Conuersion had beene made to the Protestant, or to the Roman Church: But the (c) In the euidency of this point appeareth both from booke, the writings of the Protestant Deuines of *Disputa- Wittenberg.* (c) as also from the testimony of *tionis D. Barlow*, who thus discourseth hereof: *In &c.* (d) the Primitiue Nonage of the Church, this (d) Bar- promise of Kings allegiance thereunto, was not to win so fully accomplished; because in those days, that his de- prophesy of our *Sauionr* was rather verified: *sents of the Ar-* I shall be brought before Kings for my name sicles of *sa,* by them to be persecuted enemy unto death. the Pro-
Now to reflect vpon this argument de- tustans
rived from the prophesies, that the true Religion.
Church of *Christ* shall conuert to it, the pag. 14.

Q

Gentills,

Gentills, their Kings, and Kingdomes; here
 about we see euen from the pens of our Ad-
 uersaries, that many Countryes, Kings, and
 Kingdomes haue beene conuerted to Chri-
 stianity by the Roman Catholike Church,
 but not any one Heathen king, or Country
 by the Protestant Church: whether then of
 these two Churches, is the true Church of
 Christ? Here to reply, and say, that these pro-
 phesyes are to be fulfilled, not before, but
 after the preaching of *Luthers* Gospell, is
 controuled by the iudgment of all learned
 men, and by Experience it selfe, and there-
 fore *D. Whitaker* had iust reason thus to
 confesse of this point: *Whatsoeuer* (e) the an-
 cient Prophets haue foretold of the enlarge-
 ment, amplitude, and glory of the Church; The
 same to haue beene already performed is mani-
 fident out of Histories. Thus far of this De-
 monstration, to proue, that the Protestant
 Church is not that Church, to which the
 former prophesyes of conuerting Gentills,
 Kings, and Nations do truly appertayne.

Animaduersion CXL.

Good Reader, in this one Animaduersion I
 intreate thy peculiar lattention: Thus
 then I say; *Luther* thus chargeth *Moyse*: Do
 (1) you collect together all the Wisdome of *Moy-
 ses*, and of Heathen Philosophers, and you shall
 find them to be before God, either Idolatry, or Hy-
 pocriticall Wisdome &c. Away therefore with
Moyse. Of *S. Paul* the *Magdeburgians* thus
 speak:

(e) *Whi-*
zak. 1. 7.
contra
Duræum
pa. 472.

(1) *Luth.*
rom. 3.
Wittm.
in Psal.
46. fol.
413.

k: Paul (2) doth turne to James the Apo- (2) Mag-
 and a Synod of Presbyters being called to- deb. Cent.
 ber, he is perswaded by James and the rest, 1. L. a. ca.
 for the offended Jewes he should purify him- 10.
 in the Temple; wherunto Paul yeeldeth,
 which certainly was no small syding of so great
 doctour, as not having sufficient reason there-
 Moses Law being abrogated. In the like
 condemnation of some other Apostles we
 d Brentius (the great Protestant) thus to
 ch: (*) S. Peter chiefe of the Apostles, & *) Bren-
 to Barnabas, after the Holy Ghost receaved, thus in
 together with the Church of Jerusalem, er- Apologi
 d. That the whole Church of Christ may Confess. e.
 re, D. Fulke thus literally auerreth: The (*) de Consi-
 whole Church militant, as every part thereof, lijs. pag.
 altogether erre. Touching generall Conn- 400.
 ls, Peter Martyr thus speaketh: As (3) long (*) D.
 we must in Generall Conncells, so long we shall Pu ks, in
 in the Papis errors. Of particular Fa- bis ans
 ers D. Whitaker thus censureth: Papisarum were to a
) religio est Cento &c. The popish Religion is Counter-
 atched (omerlet of the Fathers Errors sowed says Ca-
 ether. Finally Christ himselfe (both God ebolike.
 Man, and Redeemer of the world) is pag. 80.
 arged with ignorance by the Protestants; (1) Lib. de
 thus Calvin writeth: Insanus (1) foret, qui (4) Con-
 gnationem ignorantie subijceret, quam ne ipse tra Du-
 dem Drifilins nostra causa subire abnuist &c. raum. l.
 and were mad, who with discontent shoud a p. 411.
 knowledg himselfe to be subiect to ignorance; (1) Calvin
 the Sonne of God himself for our sake, in ca 14.
 and not refuse to be ignorant. And further, Marb.

Calvin speaking of Christ his prayer in the Garden, thus chargeth our Saviour: Christ

(6) *Calu. in 16. Math.* (6) *oratio in horto fuit abruptam votum, & subito elapsam, quod castigavit & remouit;* The prayer of Christ in the Garden was abrupt, not premeditated, which vow at unawares slipping from our Saviour, he after reuok'd and recalled. Thus now I wind vp my Premisses: Y

(7) *Caluin and Beza are charged with Sodomie by Contradus* particular Fathers, Yf Generall Councils, Y the whole Church militant of Christ, if the Blessed Apostles (and this after the descending downe of the Holy Ghost,) Yf May finally if Christ himselfe may erre (as Aduersaries;) what indiscretion then, what

Schlusfeld. (a great Proteflant) in Theolog. weaknes of iudgment, what motley foolishnes, or rather Lunacy is it, to ascribe infallibility of iudgment to Luther an incestuous Monke, to *Swinglini* an Apostate Priest, to *Caluin* and *Beza* two Sodomites

Caluin. printed. 1504. l. 1. fol. 72. & l. 1. ol. 91. (7) Brethren, to any other Sectary whoeuer, or finally to the priuat reuealing Spirit of ech illiterate man, who holds himselfe (through his owne pryde and ignorance) to be *afflatus*, or possessed with the Holy Ghost? or what Reason had *D. Whitaker* thus

(3) *Whitaker in Controu. q. 5. ca. 3. & 11.* ambitiously to paint out this *Prima Spiritus* in these words, *An* (8) *inward persuasion of the Holy Ghost, wrought in the closet of the believers hart?*

Animaduerſion CXLII.

When we Charge the Protestants with diuers Innouations of the auncient He-tykes, they in Recrimination thereof labour to insimulate vs with the Doctrines of the Gentils, or Heathens, as appeareth from W. Reynolds pen: And heere they chie- (*) Re-ynolds lib. insist in two poynts, to wit in the Do- de Rom.ctrine of Sacrifice, and of vower; both which Idolaſtria Doctrines were euer believed & practized and are etten at this present) by the Gen- P. 168. and Heathens. Heere I thus wye away 248. & aspersions, & yet withall I freely grant, 181. The same is at we mantayne both Sacrifice, and vower; objected by Kemp do withall acknowledge, that the Heathens by Kemp did the like; but now to the point. To haue nitius, a sacrifice, and to haue Vowes, is deriued to Examn. from the light of Nature; since euen part. 3. the Law of Nature, Men (as Men endued pag. 83. with Reason, not as Heathens) euer believed the doctrine hereof, and practized the same. In like manner the Heathens, only by the light of Nature believed, that there was God (as the Apostle sheweth;) shall we Cato-lykes therefore dissent from the Heathens in the beliefe therof? Now that the Heathens erred in the Object of their Sa-crifices and Vowes, to wit, in sacrificizing of man, and making improfitable and foolish vower, this proceeded from the Nature of man, corrupted by Originall Sinne, and not imputed in them by Christ; Euen as they

erred in the immediat *Object* of God; as not belieuing in one only true God, but repeating the Sunne and Moone, as Gods. Now heere I say, it is lawfull to agree with the *Heathens* in the generalities of the two former doctrines (since the Instinct of Nature impressed by God in Mā teacheth so much but not in the particularities of thē; seing they are most erroneous in the immediat *Object*).

Animadversion CXLII.

W Hen the Catholikes do alledge certain *Notes* of the Church, as *Antiquity*, *Universality*, *Succession*, *Conversion* of *Heathens* &c. our Aduersaries seeke to auoyde the force of some of these *Notes*, and particularly of *Succession*, and *Conversion* of *Gentiles* since, they say, these two *Notes* are claymed by confessedly false Churches; seing the *Greeke Church* houldeth *Succession*, and the *Arians* haue conuerted the *Goths* and *Vandals*. To answer hereto, I first say, these two Instances are false; for the *Greeke Church* hath its *Succession*, as interrupted, and begunne from those *Intruders*, who began their owne separation from the *Roman Church*, about the *Holy Ghosts* proceeding. And as concerning the supposed *Conversions* of the *Goths* and *Vandals* by the *Arians*, it is only pretended; Seing the *Goths* were not at the first conuerted by the *Arians*, but being conuerted before, were after by them
peruer-

peruerted, as appeareth out of *Zozomen*, l. 6. c. 37. and *Theodoret*, l. 4. cap. vlt. Secondly, I reply to the former Euation; That the Catholikes (rather to preuent the impostures of our Aduersaryes objecting hereto, the out of any absolute necessity of the said *Notes*) do propound the foresaid Marks or notes, not as proper alone to the true Church but only as markes inseparable (though not conuertible) from it; so they vndertaking thereby not to set downe in the *affirmative*, that where any such of these inseparably markes be, there the true Church certainly is: but rather in the *Negative*, that where these be wanting, there the true Church is not: But certaine it is, that these *Notes* are wanting in the Protestat Church.

Animaduersion CXLIII.

I grant, that the Catholike Religion is involved with farre more difficultyes (as may be exemplified in the doctrine of the *Real presence*) then the Protestant Religion; the reason thereof being, in that our Religion consisteth of *Affirmative* Articles, the Protestants sayth (so far forth as it differeth from the Catholike) of *Negatives*. Yet to recompence this, we fynd that the Protestant sayth is attended on (contrary to the Catholike faith herein) with diuers grosse ^{(9) *Luth.*} absurdities, necessarily, and immediatly ^{*l. de capt. Babil. c.*} flowing from the Protestants *Tenets*, or *Articles*. I heere passe ouer, how ^{(9) *Luther*} *cism*,
 houl-

(10) Luther in
Assert.
damnat.
per Leo-
nem,
Art. 36.
Beza in
his dis-
play of
Popish
practi-
ses, pag.
202.
Stim-
glius co.
1. de Pro-
videntia
fol. 366.
(*) Lu-
ther in
Assert.
art. 32.
sayth,
That all
good
works
(God
judging
them) are
mortall
sinnes.

houldeth, that Infants at the tyme of their
Baptizing haue an articulate and actual faith
of all the chiefe Mysteryes of Christianity;
That our Aduersaryes (howsoeuer they
disclayme from it in words) teach, that
God is the Author of sinne: These and many
other Tuche like aburd Doctrines I heere
passe ouer; only I will a little insist, how
(*) Luther and the rest do mantayne, that
all the good works of inff Men are Sinnes. Now
the absurdity of this doctrine how transpa-
rent is it? Since from it would follow, that
the worke of fayth, by which we are iusti-
fied, should be Sinne; as also that prayer,
wherein we pray *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*,
should be a sinne. But is it not most absurd,
that man should be iustified by Sinne, and
that he should seeke by Sinne, to obtaine
the remission of sinne? Againe from this
fountayne we might thus truly Syllogize
and reason: *All good works are to be done; but
some mortall sinnes are good Works; Therefore
some mortall sinnes are to be done.* Againe: *No
mortall sinne is to be committed; but all good
works are mortall sinnes; Therefore no good Works
is to be done.* These (Loe) are the inferences
of the former absurdity, to wit, that all good
works are mortall Sinnes; that some mortall Sin-
nes are to be committed, and that no good works
is to be donne. Now whereas by way of re-
tortion our Aduersaries, and particularly
Kempnitius in his *Examen Concilij Trident.* vp-
braid vs, that we teach a more blasphemous
doctrine

doctrine in maintayning, that we are iustified by our owne works, and not by Christ his Passion. To this I reply, that in obiection of this appears either extreme malice in our Aduersaries, or at least most wilfull ignorance. Therefore to remoue this stumbling block we say, that we are iustified by an inherent Iustice, or Renouation of life, as by the *formall Cause*; but we are also iustified by the merits of Christ his Passion, as by the *meritorious Cause*; both which different causes may stand together, without any derogation of the one to the other, contrary to the intended fraud of our Aduersaries herein, in seeking to confound these two different Causes.

Animaduerſion CXLIV.

Fit be demanded, how *Luther* first, being instructed of the *Devill* concerning his doctrine, as also being of a vicious life (as in this Treatise is in part elsewhere shewed) should for his doctrine be so much applauded, & repayed vnto by the broken members of the Catholike Church? To this may be answered, that *Luther* his select & choice preparing of his doctrine, to entertayne and cure the then seuerall affected humours of each peculiar declining estate and degree (& this being accompanied with the Visitation of Gods heauy iudgments, hanging ouer the preuayling Sinnes of those degenerate times) was the chiefe Alleuiue, for the more

easy imbracing of *Luthers* Doctrine. Now the choynenes of *Luthers* doctrine consisted (to insist in some particulars) in manning liberty of pretended Mariage in Clergy men; in his exposing of Monasteries, and other rich spoyles of the Church, to the greedy appetite of the temporal Magistrates, and finally in deluding of the simple, & full Laity with his other licentious doctrines of Salvation by only sayth, and displa-yming from the necessity of Good Works, as houlding them needles (as aboute our of his owne particular sayings we haue produced:) In the seuerall imbracing of all which (as *S. Jerome* (1) in like manner said of *Vigilantius* his followers) *Luthers* followers tauored not so much him, as their owne Vice. These are the fatal steps of *Luthers* suddaine rising greatnes: And this is the lesse so bewondred at, seeing we see, that the like (or rather far greater) progresse was made in this kind by *Mahomet*, through his absurd and licentious Doctrines, wherewith many Nations are euen at this day infected.

(1) *Ierome*
contra
Vigilantium.

Animaduersion CXLV.

YF in retaliation of what is said in this last aboute *Animaduersion*, our Aduersaries shall labour to distract their Disciples with vnequall obiecing (instead of answering) the supposed wicked liues of certaine Popes; I reply hereto, that admitting for the tyme, the said wicked liues of the

Popes

Popes to be true, and not forged, yet the disparity here resteth, in that those Popes were not the first Restorers of our Religion to light; since they liued many ages after our Catholike Religion was vniuersally professed, as appeareth aboue from the confessed antiquity of the Catholike Roman Fayth. Again: I say, the Question heere is not, whether the high Priests of the Old Law, or the High Priests now, haue after the establishment of Religion beene sometimes wicked Men or not; but the touch of the Question here issuable is, whether the truth of Religion, hauing beene extinct (as is supposed) or to the World latent, and inuisible for so many hundred yeares (as is in this Treatise confessed by our Aduersaries, to haue beene extinct and inuisible) may with any probability be thought to be reuealed or restored to the world, by men of flagitious and wicked Liues; I meane by *Luther, Strigelius, Calvin, (2) and Beza (3)* both which last two are condemned of the execrable Sinne of Sodomy, euen by other Protestants their breethren; And heere the doubt or Question resteth.

Animaduersion CXLVI.

THE Prophet speaking with difference of the Synagogue of the Iewes, in the Old Law, 2. fol. 72.
 (1) Beza charged with Sodomy by the fore said Schlageisburg ydd
 supra, and l. 1. fol. 91. Hefsbuius (a Protestant) in his booke
 entituled, Veræ & fæcæ Confessionis &c.

(1) Cal-
 uin charged with
 Sodomy
 by the
 publiks
 of the Ci-
 ty of
 Noyon
 in Præce,
 yet ex-
 tant, and
 by Con-
 radus
 Schlus-
 selburg,
 (a Pro-
 testant)
 in Theo-
 log. Cal-
 uinist.
 printed,
 1594.

- Law**, and of the Church of Christ in the New, thus writeth: *The glory (4) of this last bea-*
(4) Ag- *thus writeth: The glory (4) of this last bea-*
geus. 2. *(meaning the Church of Christ) shall be greater then the first; with whom conspireth the*
Apostle, saying: (with reference to the la-
(5) Hebr. *with Law, and the Law of Christ; (5) Christ is*
8, *a mediator of a better Testament, which is estab-*
lished upon better promises. Now from these
passages of Scripture I demonstratiuely de-
duce, that the Protestant Church is not the
true Church of Christ; since touching in-
visibility, it is much inferiour to the Synago-
gue of the Jews; I mean (which is a Cir-
cumstance here chiefly to be obserued) even
since the coming of the Messias, which
was the appointed tyme of the Synagogues
Decay, and the Christian Churches in-
crease. For it is fully confessed heretofore,
that for the thousand yeares last before Lu-
ther (or rather some few tallages more, be-
fore the said thousand yeares) the Prote-
stant Church hath continued unknown,
latent, and invisible. Whereas on the other
part, it appeareth by sufficient authority of
Histories in all tymes, that the Jews during
all those ages, and ever since Christs tyme,
haue had their Synagogues (though vnder
some kind of restraint) yet disperied,
knowne, and visible in the most notable
Prouinces of the world, as Greece, Italy,
Spayne, France, Germany, England &c. And
thus we see, that the scandall, or scruple
hence arising, hath bene an argument for
some

some Protestants, to apostatate from Christian Religion, and to become Jewes; as Bernardine Ochine, Newferns chiefe Pastour of Heidelberg, and others, (as I haue shewed elswhere) since these men (altogether reiecting the Catholike Church, as false and Idolatrous) did well obserue, that the former Prophecy of the *Visibility* of the Church of God, was not fulfilled in their Protestant Church.

Animaduersion CXLVII.

Y F we might rest vpon the seuerall iudgments of the Protestants, it would follow, that most of the chiefe Controversies, betweene vs and them, should be but *ira Rat.* points of *Indifferency*, and the contrary Camp. *pa* houlding them off either syde, should not be *78. and* preiudiciall to Mans Saluation; which *in his* course is indeed to introduce a Neutrality *answers* of Religion, or rather a contempt of all *to M.* Religion. I will exemplify in diuers particulars: And (1) first, concerning satisfaction, and *William* *Reynolds* *cap. 8.* *pag. 135.* *(7) In* *his Ep* *extant in* *the Book* *entituled,* *Centuria* *Epistol.* *primæ,* thus fauorably Melancthon writeth *Theolog.* thereof: The (7) Monarchy of the Bishop of *74* *Rome*

Rome is profitable to this end, that consent may be retained; Wherefore an agreement might easily be established in this Article of the Popes Primacy, if other Articles could be agreed upon. Touching our Lady, being preserved from Originall Sinne, and worshipping of Images.

- (8) Bun. M. Banny thus writeth: In these (8) or such like whosoever will condemn all those to be non-pacification. sect. in, as we are &c. committeth an uncharitable part towards his brethren. 4. Concerning receauing under one or both kinds, Luther thus teacheth: Si (9) veneris ad locum, ubi tantum una species ministratur, cum alijs una tantum specie utere &c. 5. Concerning the Doctrine of the Reall Presence, D. Reynolds sayth: The (10) Doctrine of the Reall Presence is but (as it were) the grudging of a little against otherwise the party should the Christian sayth. 6. Of Innocation of Saints, D. Goad, (11) & D. Fulke affirme, that it doth not exclude from being members of the Church &c. 7. of Honoring Saints Reliques, and Prayer for the dead, M. Spark thus discourseth: We are (12) not so hasty to pronounce condemnation of any such Errors; for you know well enough, that we make not these matters such, as that either we think, that all must be saved, that should the one way, or all condemned, that should the other. 8. Of Freewill, and prayer for the Dead, and some other points, M. Cartwright thus censureth:

Campian, the 2. dayes Conference Arg. 8. Res. 11. & 111. (13) Sparks in his answer to M. Iohn d'Albines. pag 381.

Indifferency (13) of the Doctrines of Free- (13) Carr.
 prayer for the Dead, & a number of others, which
 necessary Doctrines, is such, wherein men being in his Re-
 sisted, have notwithstanding beene saved. 9. ply, p. 14.
 ally concerning Masse, Luther thus wri- See l. 2. c. 1.
 the Primate Masse (14) hath deceaved many (14) Lau-
 iusts, and carryed them away into Error, ther, in
 in the tyme of Gregory, for 800. yeares. Thus Collog.
 for a tast touching many points euen of Germa-
 eatest consequence betweene the Church nicis, car-
 Rome, and the Protestants, houlden by de Missa.
 the Protestants to be of that *Adiaphorons*
 indifferent Nature, as that the believing
 them, or deniall of them is no hinderance
 the Salvation of the Soule: So ready we
 and euen the most learned Protestants (a-
 gainst the Nature of true fayth, and of the
 aduise of the primitiue Church) to dog-
 etize a Neutrality of Christian Religion.

Animaduerſion CXLVIII.

He *Antimoni*, who denied the Law of
Moyſes, and the *Libertines* who teach all (15) In-
 sensuality (all most impure, & wicked He- Conſe-
 stikes) may in a true iudgment, be rightly sione
 iud, to be descended from the loynes of Mans-
 ther. Of the *Antimoni* (so called, by rea- feld. Mi-
 son of their impugning the Law of the Old nistro-
 Testamēt) the Protestant Deuines of Mans- rum. tit.
 eld thus report them to teach: *Lex diuina de Anti-*
qua non est, que verbum Dei appelletur &c. nomis.
Antoni, (15) qui circa Moyſem, hoc est decem fol. 89. &
recepta, versantur, ad Diabolum pertinent; 20.

Ad

Ad patibulum cum Moyse. Thus these Doctines relate the Doctrine of the Antinomians. And do not the Antinomians suck this their blasphemous doctrine from Luther, who

(16) Luther thus writeth of Moyse: *Moyse* (16) *hath his lips unpleasant, stopped, angry &c.* Do you call that all the wisdom of *Moyse* &c. and you shall find it to be either idolatry or hypocriticall wisdom, or (if it be politicks) the wisdom of *Arath* &c. away therefore with *Moyse*. Now that the

Libertines do in like manner spring originally from Luther, is no lesse evident. Their doctrine Calvin deliuereth in these words: *Persuadent* (17) *nihil mali esse in stupris & adulterijs, cum deo omnia fieri cognoscimus.* The Libertines perswade themselves, that there is no euill in fornication and adulteries; Seing (say they) we all know, that all things proceed from God. And from this their Doctrine are so many writings published by the Libertines, wherein is defended all Epicurisme, and (18) impurity of life. Now that Luther layeth the ground of the Libertines Doctrine, obserue what followeth: God (19) *worketh the wicked works in the wicked &c.* And againe: It is not in mans power to thinke Good or Euill, but all things proceed from absolute necessity. And as

for extenuating of vice, as not hurtfull to Man, and depreiing of vertue (in both damnable, which points the Libertines agree with Luther) I refer the Reader to what is above set downe out of Luthers owne words: *On art. 36.* by I will here repeat one or two of his speeches.

teaches. Touching good works (equally
 dislaymed both by Luther, and the Liber-
 (20) Luther thus writeth: No work is dis- (20) Lu-
 of God, unlesse the author thereof th. in his
 disalowed before. And concerning Sinne, sermons
 Luther thus teacheth: (21) A Christian bap- Englished
 is so rich, that though he would, he cannot p. 147.
 lose his Salvation by any sinne how great soe- (21) Lu-
 unlesse he will not believe. Which two Do- th. so. 2.
 trines of Luther are the very source, from Wistemb.
 whence spring the Libertines Herelies. de caps,

Animadversion CXLIX.

TO forbear the testimonies of Diuine
Scripture, of generall *Conncells*, (22) and
 of the ancient *Fathers* (23) in prooffe of *Pur-*
gatory; I will here content my selfe with ar-
 guments two or three, drawne from *Rea-*
 son, which are in my iudgment of iufficient
 force, for the beliefe of this dogmaticall
 point. The first Argument then may be this:
 There are certaine *Veniall Sinnes* (as is pro-
 ued out of *S. Iames* c. 1. and *1. Cor. 9.* which
 are worthy only of temporall punishment;
 but it may so fortune, that a Man may de-
 part out of this life with such Sinnes not ex-
 ated: But it is not intelligible, how an idle
 word (for example) should out of its owne
 nature deserue the perpetuall hate of God,

R

and *Epipb.* in

*Adonis contra Hæc hæc 71. Chryl. dem. 41. in 1. ad Cor. Ter-
t. de coronamist. Cyprian 1. Epist. 9. Ambros. 1. a. Epist. 8.
Iulianum, Nilson Epist. ad Pamphyl. b. August. de cura pro-
priet. 2. 1. 67 in Enchirid. cap. 110.*

and sempiternall flames. The second Reason; When Sinners are reconciled to God, the whole temporall punishment is not euer remitted with the Sinne; Thus though God remitted to *David* his Sinne (in 2. Reg. 12.) yet for temporall castigation he punished him with the death of his Sonne. But it may so fall out, that a man hath not fully satisfied at the hower of his death for his temporall punishment; therefore it necessarily followeth, that there is a place of *Purgatory*, wherein all temporall punishment is to be suffered. The third reason: We see that of those, who depart this life, some are very good and vertuous; others very euill and wicked; others againe are reasonably good, and reasonably euill. Now, from hence, euen by the force of Reason, we may conclude, that there is after this Life eternall punishments for those which be extremely wicked, and eternall rewards for the very good and pious; and then by proportion and analogy temporall punishments (& by them a passage to Eternall rewards) for those, who are but reasonably good, and reasonably euill. Neither standeth it with Gods iustice, and goodnes, that a most vertuous man through his whole life, dying, & also another man dying, who hath committed many veniall Sinnes vsatisfied, or hath only the guilt and eternal punishment of many great mortall Sinnes forgiven, without any temporall satisfaction at all

for

for them made, should both indifferently enjoy immediately after their departure out of this life, the same reward of Glory and Eternity. The last reason may be this: That opinion which taketh away Purgatory, is most pernicious, and therefore it cannot be true: For it maketh men slouthfull in auoyding Sinne, and doing of good works (as elsewhere is intimated.) For who is perswaded, that there is no Purgatory, but that all sinnes are presently abolished by death in those who dye with true fayth, may thus reason with himselfe; *To what end do I labour in fasting, Prayer, Continency, Almesdeeds? Why do I deprive my selfe of pleasures, seeing at my death all my Sinnes, whether they be many or few, shall at once be cancelled?* But who belieueth that besides Hell, there is a most horrible fyar of Purgatory; and that what in this life is not washed away by due works of Penance, shall in that fyar be purged; will be far more diligent, and cautelous in leading of his life.

Animaduerſion C L.

T Ouching the Induration, or Hardening of Pharaos Hart, so much vrged by our Aduersaries, to proue that God is the Author of Sinne, we are to note; that where as our very Aduersaries, and particularly Melancthon (24) confesse, that the Hebrew word here vsed, signifyeth only Permission, tinge- the Jewish Rabins are accordingly so playne

(24) Melancthon
confesseth
the same
in loc.
Com cap.
de causa
peccati
& con-

in affirming with vs the same to be only by
 Gods permission, and not by his working, the
 (15) In Peter (25) Martyr, and Munster (26) do ac-
 Epiſt. ad cordingly acknowledg this the *Iewes* fore-
 Rom. said exposition. Melancthons words (confel-
 cap. 9. sing that the Hebrew word signifyeth in
 (16) An- this place, only Permission) are these: *Nec
 notat in gura illa verborum offendant. Inuocabat Co
 Exod. Pharaonis, & similes; Certum est enim Hebraice
 cap. 7. phrazi significare Permissionem, non volunta-
 tem efficacem: That is, these formes of words in
 not offend vs, for it is certaine, that in the He-
 brew phrase they signify only permission, and not
 any efficacions will. Add hereto, how repug-
 nant our Aduersaries exposition of this, &
 diuers other such Texts, is to the words of
 God, deliuered by Ezechiel cap. 33. which
 words may serue, as a Syntax, or Comment,
 to paraphrase al the threatening passages, set
 downe in Scripture against Sinners, and a-
 gainst the doctrine of Reprobation; shewing
 that all such comminations are only Com-
 mitional. Thus then Ezechiel in the Person of
 God: *Si dixerit impio. &c. If I shall say to the
 wicked, Thou shalt dye the death; and he doe pen-
 nance for his Sinne, and do Iudgment and ius-
 tice, lining he shall line, and shall not dye.**

Animaduersion. C L I.

THE example of *Elias* is much prostituted
 by our Aduersaries, for the warranting
 of their owne Churches Inuisibility for
 many ages; but how impertinently it is
 used,

ed, obserue what followeth: First I say, this
 example maketh wholly against the Prote-
 stants, seeing the words of *Elias*, *Religiosum* (17) *Reg.*
 (27) *solus*, were not spoken generally of all
 the *Iewish* people, but only in regard of the
 Country of *Israel*; and accordingly God
 answered the complaint of *Elias*, with re-
 straint to that only Country, the Scripture
 saying immediatly after: *I haue left to me in*
Israel *seauen thousand*, *which haue not bowed*
unto Baal. Add hereto that in those very
 tymes the Church did greatly flourish in the
 adioyning Countreyes of *Iuda*, as was to
Elias then knowne, and visible, vnder the
 reigne of *Asa* and *Iosaphat*. And thus is
 this obiection (so much prized by diuers
 of our Aduersaries) answered by (28) *Me-* (18) *Is*
aiabon, & *Enoch* (29) *Glappam*. Againe, ad- *corpore*
 mitting these seauen thousand were vn- *Doctri-*
 knowne to *Elias*, yet followeth it not, that *us pag.*
 they were vnknowne to all others at that *530.*
 tyme: Much lesse then, is this example of (19) *In*
 force to proue, that the Church of God *his Soue-*
 may be latent and inuisible for many hun- *raigne*
 dred yeares together, not to one *Elias* only, *remedy.*
 but to the whole World. But for a further *pag. 17.*
 discovering of the weakenes of this Exam-
 ple, let vs grant for the tyme, that the *Iewish*
 Synagogue was in the dayes of *Elias* wholly
 inuisible, yet is this example most defecti-
 uely alledged, as applyed to the Church of
 Christ. Since the predictions and promises (30) *Fla-*
 made to the Church of Christ, *whose* (30) *br. cap. 8.*

(31) So
Writeth
D. Rey-
nolds in
his Con-
ference
with M.
Hart. pa.
68.

(31) In
Eccles.
Policy, l.
2 p. 116.
(32) These
meanes
are set
downe by
D. Rey-
nolds in
his Con-
ference,
p. 83. 84.
& se-
quentib.
and by
D. Whi-
taker de
sacra
scriptu-
ra p. 511
512. 513.

testament is established in better promises, are far greater, and more worthy, then those of the Iewish Synagogue. Again the foresaid Example doth not extend to the whole Church of God before Christ; but only to the Iewish Synagogue, as being a part or member therof; for besides the Iewes, there were diuers others saythfull, as Melchisedech, Cornelius, the Eunuch of the Queene of Candace, &c. Thus far in solution of this obiection.

Animaduerſion CLII.

O V R Aduersaries do first teach, that concerning Matter of sayth, they are to be-
lieue nothing for certaine, but only the holy Scripture. Secondly they teach, that
(31) it is not the shew, but the sense of the words of Scripture, that must decide Controuerſies. And that herein the Scripture doth not instruct them of it self, but by certaine meanes, as M. Hooker (32) affirmeth: Thirdly, these Meanes are affirmed to be, the reading
(33) thereof, the Conference of places, the weighing of the circumstances of the Text, skill in tongues, diligence, and prayer. Fourthly they affirm, that these being Actions on their behalfe, are but humane Endeauours, and such, wherein euery man without extraordinary priuiledge from God, is subiect to Errour. Fifthly, they teach, that these meanes, according to the Nature of themselves afford a necessary doubtfullnes and vncertainty of opinion; and therefore D. Whitaker

thus writeth hereof: *Qualia* (34) *illa media* (14) *D.*
sunt, talem ipsam interpretationem esse necesse Whitak.
est: at media interpretandi loca obscura sunt in de Eccles.
certa, dubia, & ambigua: Ergo fieri non potest, contra
quinipsa etiam interpretatio incerta sit; Si in- Bellarmi
certa, tunc esse potest falsa; Thus D. Whitaker Controu.
 discourseth of the foresaid meanes of in-2. q. 4. p.
 interpreting the Scripture. Now these being^{217.}
 the confessed grounds and principles of our
 Aduersaries Doctrine, they do appeare to
 be no other, but as it were linked chaynes,
 or naked connexions of vnauoydable vn-
 certainty; which point appeareth more ful-
 ly from the example of *Luther, Swinglins, &*
Caluin; all who vanted, that they did vse the
 foresaid meanes in interpreting these few
 words, *Hoc est corpus meum*; and yet the end
 was, that they deliuered mere contrary con-
 structions of the said words; so as supposing
 one of their constructions to be true, it fol-
 loweth necessarily, that the other Construc-
 tion is false.

Animaduerfion CLIII.

THE Absurdities necessarily accompaning
 the doctrine of the Pope being *Anti-*
christ, are many and great. For the more
 cleere vnderstanding whereof, we are here
 to reapeate, what was aboue deliuered vpon
 other occasions. First then *Luther* thus wri-
 teth: *We* (35) *Confesse, that there is vnder the*
Papacy most of the Christian good, yea rather all
the Christian Good, and that from thence it came
 (15) *Lut-*
 sb. lib.
 contra
 Ana-
 baptist.

(36) D.
Doue in
his per-
suasion
to En-
glish Re-
cufants,
pag. 33.

to us. Verily we confesse, that in the Papacy there is true Scripture, true baptisme, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true Keyes of Remission of sinnes &c. Yea further, that there is in the Papacy true Christianity, or rather the true Kernel of Christianity. Thus far Luther : with whom (to omit diuers other Protestants) D. Doue conspireth, saying : (36) We hold the Creed of the Apostles, of Athanasius, of Nice, of Ephesus, of Constantinople, and the same Bible, which we receaued from them. Now marke the ineuitable absurdity, ryling from the premisses: If the Pope (being the head of the Papacy) be *Antichrist* (as our Aduersaries do dreame) doth it not then inauoydably follow, that with *Antichrist* there is all the Christian Good; that from *Antichrist* the Protestants receaue the true Scripture, true Baptisme, & the true vse of other Sacraments (to wit, of the Altar, and Absolution of our sinnes) Finally, that from *Antichrist* they receaue the Apostles Creed, and the other Creeds aboue specified ? What impossibilityes are these? and is not this potentially and implicitly to turne *Christ* into *Antichrist*?

Againe, the Scripture prophesyeth, that the Church of Christ (as I haue shewed aboue) shall conuert Kings, and Kingdomes of the Gentills vnto it, according to those words of *Esay* speaking of the Church of Christ; *Thou (37) shalt sucke the milke of the Gentills, and the breasts of Kings*; And against it is prophesied of the Church by the Kin-

Prophet: 7 (38) will give thee the Heathens (38) Psal.
thy inheritance, and the End of the Earth for a
thy possession. Now two things are cleare:
the first, that many Heathen Kingdomes
have beene converted to Christianity by
the Pope, and his ministers; This is proved
from the cōfession of D. Whitaker, who ack-
nowledging the conversion of many Coun-
tries made by the Church of Rome, thus
debaileth them: *The (39) Conversion of so ma-* (39) *Whi*
ny Nations after the tyme of Gregory have not *hak. l. 42*
been pure, but corrupt. Now that the Prote- *Eccles.*
stant Church neuer converted any Gentill,
King, or Nation to the sayth of Christ, ap-
peareth from its cōfessed Inuitibility for so
many ages till Luthers tyme, above set
downe. Thus then I here argue: The predi-
ctions of converting Kings, and Kingdomes
to the sayth of Christ, were performed by
the Pope only, and his Substituts, and not
by the Protestants: Therefore the predi-
ctions for the enlarging of Christ his Church
by converting Gentills vnto it, were perfor-
med by *Antichrist*, Christs designed Enemy.
How do these stand together? and yet do
these incompatibilities necessarily result
out of the former Assertions.

Animadversion CLIV.

The example of *Papbunius* his standing in
the Nicene Councell, in defence of
Priests marriage (so much insisted vpon by
so many eminent Protestants) is misapplied,

(40) So
relateth
Socrates,
l. r. ca. 8.

and withall, in all likely hood, most false; It is misapplyed, because where it is vrged in prooffe of Priests Mariage, it proueth the contrary; For though perhaps *Paphnutius* might be perswaded, that Priesthood did not dissolue Mariage afore contracted; yet he sayth plainly: *Those, (40) who are made Priests before they are married. cannot after marry:* And this *Paphnutius* calleth, *Veterem Ecclesie traditionem: The ancient tradition of the Church.* So far was *Paphnutius* from alcribing the doctrine of Priests not marrying after the Order of Priesthood taken, to the *Conncell of Nice*. Now, that this example of *Paphnutius*, is vnttrue, many probabilities may be vrged; First, because there is not so much as any Mention of this matter concerning *Paphnutius* made by any, who did wryte of the Nicene Council, before *Socrates* tyme (who first relateth the words of *Paphnutius*.) For neither did *Ensebius*, *Athanasius*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, nor yet *Ruffinus* himielfe, (who writ many things of *Paphnutius*, and of the Nicene Council) all being more ancient then *Socrates*, make any mention of this matter. Now I here demaund, could all these be silent in so great a busines, and so earnestly debated in the *Nicene Council*? Secondly, this example of *Paphnutius* seemeth to be against the third Canon of the said *Nicene Council*, which altogether forbiddeth Priests to haue dwelling with them any Woman, other then their Mother, Sister,

their

their Fathers sister, their Mothers sister &c. Now if, as Socrates reporteth in the example of Paphnutius, the Councell had left liberty for married Laymen afterwards made Priests, to haue kept still their former Wyues, why then was not the wyfe first placed here in the exception, but altogether omitted? This example of Paphnutius is so much suspected to be false, that Frigenilleus (41) Gannius (a Protestant) doth plainly ascribe it to the forgery of Socrates.

Animaduerſion C L V.

[I]T will not be amisse to obserue the Protestants Method, in disputing with the Catholikes, touching the *Reall Presence*, as it is taught by the Church of Rome. For the Question of the *Reall Presence* being but propounded, they quickly tell vs, that Christ neuer intended, or *willed* it; which answer is made (to omit all other Protestants) by (42) Bullinger. And when to declare Christs Will therein, we alledge his words; they make then a new question of his *power*, as denying such to be his will, or sense of words, vnder pretence, that it is (43) contradictory to the truth and Nature of his humane body, now in Heauen; and so is thereby impossible. And when in reply thereto we proue to them directly, that it is not impossible, then returning per *circuitum* to their firste Euasion, they answer, that the Question (44) is not of his *power*, but only

(41) In
his palma
Christia-
na, p. 103.

(42) In
his De-
cads in
English

serm. 2. p. 1

971.

(43) So
an/ve.

reth ubi
tak. in his

an/ve. co:
St. Will-

liam Rey-
nolds, p. 179.

(44) So
an/ve.

reth D.
Whitak.

in his
answers

to St.
Reynolds

refuta-
tion pag.

1921.

of

of his Will, and so dancing in a round, they trifle and delude vs, by a subtile escape of an endles Circulation.

Animaduerſion CLVI.

IT is most certaine, that the doctrine of many of our Aduerſaries touching the *Reall Presence*, is inuolued with greater ſheer of Impossibility, then our Catholike doctrine thereof is: for whereas they teach, that *Christs* reall body, is really (45) and truly present, and yet not bodily and corporally, but only *Spiritually present*; By which word (*Spiritually*) they do not exclude the true and reall presence of his body. Now, how this should be free from repugnaney, and meere contradiction (and therefore impossible) I cannot discern; For to affirme, that *Christs* very body, (and not only a figure, or efficacy thereof) should be truly and really present, and yet not bodily, but *spiritually present*, is in it selfe inexplicable, and as *Swinglius* (46) in confutation thereof truly obserueth, is vpon the matter no other thing, then to turne his body into a Spirit. For as the true substance of *Christs* Spirit, cannot be said to be present to vs only corporally or bodily, and not *spiritually*, because it is a spirit, and no Body; so neither may the substance it selfe of *Christs* very body, be said to be present to vs, not bodily, but only *Spiritually* (nor at all *spiritually*, vnlesse we do, which is impertinent

(45) So teach besides many others) M. Perkins in his reformed Catholike, pag. 187. and D. Fulkerson gainst the Rymisch Teſtament, in 1. Cor. 11. (46) Stillingham 2. de vera et falsa religione fol. 206.

pertinent to the matter in hand) vnderstand
the word *Spiritual*, as the Apostle doth 1.
Cor. 13. because it is a true and real *body*, &
no *Spirit*.

Animaduerſion CLVII.

V *Uniuersality* of our Catholike Doctrine
in all chiefeſt points, diſperſed throug-
out all Nations, euen by the acknowledg-
ment of our Aduerſaries (as appeareth from
their confeſſed Inuiſibility of their owne
Church and Religion for ſo many ages) is
a moſt ſtrong Argument of the truth of
our Catholike Religion. My reaſon here-
otis, in that the doctrine of the Roman
Church could not by any pretended cor-
ruption be deriued from that Church to ſo
many Nations, ſo far remote and diſtant
each from other; Sundry of which Nations
were vnknowne to the Latin Church, and
many of them at variance therewith, in
ſome ſmall points. Therefore from hence I
conclude, that our Catholike fayth was the
Primitive fayth, firſt taught by the Apoſtles,
in all thoſe far different Nations, wherein
no leſſe then in ſome other principall points
of fayth, imbraced both by the Catholike
and the Proteſtant, (ſuch as is the *Trinity*,
the *Baptiſme* of Infants, and ſuch like) the
foreſaid Nations did, and yet do agree, not-
withſtanding their diſagreement in leſſer
Matters.

Ani-

(47) D.

Reynolds

in his

Confe-

rence

with M.

Hart, pa.

370. and

371.

(48) D.

Gardiner

in his

Dialogue

between

Irenaeus

and An-

timachus,

of the vi-

tas and

Cereмо-

nies of

the

Church

of En-

gland,

printed

at Lon-

don, 1603.

fol. b. 3.

(49) Cal-

uin de

Causa

Domini,

in tract.

Theol.

prints f. 1597. pag. 7. (50) Calvin, l. 4. in Tit. c. 3. sect. 16.

Animaduerſion CLVIII.

Diuers of the Iewish Ceremonies may be still maintained, though (as contrary in iudgment hereto) *D. Reynolds* (47) is notabashed to object against vs many Ceremonies of the *Jewes*, as if we did offend & sinne in our Ceremonies; bearing some resemblance to the said Iewish Ceremonies. But against this error of his and other Protestants, I alledge first, that (as *D. Gardiner* (48) though our Aduersary truly teacheth) the Iewish Ceremonies, which haue ceased, and may not now be retayned, are most properly those, which were ordained to signify some thing, as being *Future*, and to be accomplished in *Christ*, as for example, the *Paschall Lambe*, which signified his *Passion* to come; But as concerning *Ceremonies* of other kind, that in the ancient Fathers iudgment they might lawfully be retained, or vsed, and so accordingly were by them vsed in the celebration of the publicke Liturgy; is confessed by (49) *Caluin*. Secondly, we giue instance of sundry *Ceremonies*, vsed in the *Old Testament*, and yet now retayned; as *paying of Tythes*, *Our Churches* with reference to their Temples, *Pentecost*, *Holy dayes*, *Eleuation of hands*, and genuflection in tyme of prayer, *Imposition of hands*, & diuers others. Thirdly, that the Church of *Christ* might, and did in the Apostles tymes borrow Rites from the *Old Testament*, is confessed by (50) *Cal-*

is, and others; yea Peter Martyr thus plain-
ly writeth hereof: *Many (51) things the Church hath borrowed from the Decrees of Moses, yea and that from the first tymes. Now these Ceremonies (as also others) are vsed chiefly to stir vp in vs deuotion; and that how forcible they are thereto, I will content my selfe with the Authority of S. Austin here- in, who thus writeth: There (52) are certaine figures (he meaning Ceremonies) by the celebra- tion, and vse thereof, (not to God, but to vs) profitable offices of Piety are exercised. Againe: (53) When we kneele downe, when we stretch out ad Mar- row hands, when we lye prostrate vpon the cellum ground &c. a man by these doth better stir vp possi- himself to pray. Thus Austin.*

Animaduerſion CLIX.

THOUGH the doctrine of the Masse hath beene briefly discourſed of before in some *Animaduerſions*; yet I hold it conue- nient heere to relate the *Antiquity* of the word Masse, still retayned by vs. First then, Peter Martyr thus writeth: *Austin (54) maketh mention of the word Masse in his 237. ser- mon de Tempore, as also in his 91. serm. de Tem- pore. In like manner the Century Writers (55) reprove S. Ambrose, for mentioning the word Masse. D. Fulke (56) acknowledgeth, (57) Cent. that Victor (who liued within the first fūe hundred yeares) doth in his History vse the terme of Masse, by which (sayth D. Fulke) it meant the celebration of the Communion, & memory*

(51) Peter Martyr in his E-
pistles an-
nexed to
his Com-
mon pla-
ces in
English.
p. 118.
(52) Au-
stin.
Epist. 4.
(53) When we kneele downe, when we stretch out ad Mar-
row hands, when we lye prostrate vpon the cellum
ground &c. a man by these doth better stir vp possi-
himself to pray. Thus Austin.
(54) Austin.
serm. 10. 4
de cura
770 Mor-
tuis c. 9.
(55) Pe-
ter Mar-
tyr in his
Common
places
shed. par.
4 p. 115.
(56) Cent.
4. col. 105
(57) Fulk
in his Re-
tensua. p.
60.

memory of the Sacrifice of Christ. Now if our Aduersaries will reply to all this, saying the Word *Masse*, is not found in the *Scriptures*, therefore it auaieth not, that the Fathers did vse it; let them (as is aboue touched) in full answer of this condemned *Sophisme* remember, that although both we and they do professe to belieue the *Trinity*, or *Person*, yet themselves cannot fynd the word *Trinity*, mentioned in the *Scriptures*, neither the word, *Person*, according to the foresaid sense.

Animadversion CLX.

IT is euident by all obseruation & examples of former tymes, that the liues of those men were euermore austere and sanctified, whom God did chuse to be the first publishers or Restorers of Religion, or reformers of his Church. This is verified in the Example of *Moyse* in the Old Law, and of the *Apostles* in the first preaching of the Euangelicall Law, (all of them being most pious, most religious, and most leuall to themselves in their manners and Conversation.) This then being as a presumptuous ground & principle; we are to call to mind what aboue is granted by our Aduersaries to wit, that *Luther*, and his schollars after following, were the first restorers of the Protestants sayth; their Church for so many ages afore being latent and inuisible. Here further we are to call to mynde, that next

Luther, the chiefest Protestants for en-
larging of Protestantcy, and spreading of
their supposed Gospell, were these follow-
ing, *Swinglius*, *Melancthon*, *Carlostadius*, *La-
tus Andreas*, *Bucer*, *Ochinus*, *Caluin* and
Beza. Now in this next place we are to weigh
whether these men were licentious, dislo-
cate, and wicked in their Conuersation; or
virtuous and religious in their Courses: but
it is more then euident, that *Luther*, and all
the rest of these were of most flagitious &
absolute manners. The truth of which
point (through the largenes of the subiect)
we in expresse words to set downe, this
place is not capable of; Since in these my
animadversions I affect all breuity: There-
fore, I most earnestly inreate the studious
reader to peruse the booke entituled, *Luth-
ers Lyfe*, written by the Authour of the
Protestants Apology. The Subiect of that
booke is to lay open the enormous, & bad
especially of *Luther*, *Swinglius*, *Melan-
cthon*, *Carlostadius*, *Jacobus Andreas*, *Bucer*,
Ochinus, *Caluin*, and *Beza*. And what is there
deliuered, is not deliuered from the pens &
assertions of the Catholikes (for that
course would be held suspected, and par-
tiall) but from the pens and Relations of
the Protestants themselves. I assure the Rea-
der, that in that booke he shall find some
of those former men to be charged with
Fornication, *Adultery*; others with *Sodomy*;
others againe charged with *Episcopism*, broa-
ching

ching of blasphemous doctrines; and others, gaine apostating from Christianity, & making themselves by Circumcision, open Twisters Jewes; and all this (as aboue said) there produced from the Protestants owne accusations of them: they thus prophanely living after their beginning to preach their Gospell. Now here I refer to any Man carefull of his Salvation, whether he can be persuaded, that God would euer out of his goodness and providēce choose such facinorous, impious, and detestable men to be the Reuealers, or restorers of the truth of Reli-

(57) Mas.

7.

(58) Whi

tak. de

sacra scri-

ptura cō-

tra Bel-

larm. con-

trou. 2. q.

4. p. 382.

(59) Me-

lancth. l.

1. Epist.

Iusto Io-

na, pag.

455.

(60) Zan-

chius, de

sacra

scriptura

p. 388.

gion, supposing it were till that tyme abolished and extinct; and the rather, Since men do (57) not gather grappes of thornes, nor figs of thistles. Once more I exhort the Reader to the perusing of the foresaid Booke.

Animaduerfion CLXI.

Grammaticall and literall construction of the words of Scripture is euer houlden the best and securest, euen in the iudgment of our learned Aduersaries; for thus D. Whittaker writes of this point: *Qui (58) potest Grammaticum sensum Scripturae ubique assequi, is optime proculdubio Scripturas explanabit, atque interpretabitur.* And Melancthon accordeth thereunto saying: (59) *Multas magnas res antea inuolutas Syntaxis profert & exponit.* The syntax doth expayne many things, aforeinvolued with difficulties. Lastly to omit others, (60) Zanchius (the great Protestant) much relyeth

elyeth vpon the *Grammaticall and Literall* sense of the Scripture. Now, this principle and ground being granted (as in reason it ought to be) how great is our Aduantage herein against our Aduersaries; who reiecting the *Grammaticall and literall* Sense of the passages of Scripture by vs insisted vpon, do euer seeke to interpret them *figuratively or allegorically*? For Example; we rest in the *Grammaticall sense* and construction of that passage, *This is (61) my body &c. This is my blood &c.* In like sort for the *Primacy of Peter*, we vrge the *literall sense* of that passage: *Thou (62) art Peter, and vpon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not preuaile against it.* Also for remission of Sinnes by man: *Whose sinnes (63) you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sinnes you shall retayne, they are retayned.* And more touching works: *Do you not see, that (64) man is iustified by Works, and not by sayth only.* Finally (to omit infinit other testimonies) that perspicuous place for remitting of Original sinne by Baptisme: *Except a man (65) be borne againe of Water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of Heaven.* In all which places we do vrge the *Grammaticall, playne, and literall* sense; whereas our Aduersaries seeke to expound all the said diuine Authorities by *figures and Tropes*. Add hereto, that the Protestants in their vrging of Scripture against vs, do for the most part alledge it, not in its *literall or immediat Grammaticall*

sense, but in some secondary sense, seconded by Inferences and deductions, at most but probable, though often absurd and false.

Animadversion CLXII.

(66) Lu-

ther in

rom. 7.

Wittenb.

fol. 403.

(67) Lu-

th. loc.

com. class.

p. 43.

(68) Of

the

Church. l.

3 fol. 170.

(69) D.

Connell in

his ans-

wer to

John

Burges.

p. 2.

(70) For-

rester in

Monar-

Testagra-

phica &c

ap. proe.

mio. par.

3.

(71) Go-

marus in-

clus.

bus spec.

vera Ec-

clesia. p. 96 (72)

He prayes giuen to S. Austin by the

Protestants are most great; For first Lu-

ther thus speaketh of him: Since (66) the A-

postlestymes the Church neuer had a better Do-

ctour, then S. Austin. And againe: After the

(67) sacred Scriptures; there is no Doctour in

the Church, who is to be compared to Austin.

D. Fyeld thus extolleth him: Austin the (68)

greatest of all the Fathers, and worthiest Demine

Church. l. the Church of God euer had since the Apostlesi-

mes. D. Connell: Austin (69) was a man far be-

yond all that euer went before him, or shal in lik-

elyhood follow after him, both for Diuine and hu-

mane learning. M. Forrester (a Protestant)

styleth Austin: That (70) Monarch of the Fa-

thers, S. Austin. Gomarus (another Prote-

stant) thus celebrateth S. Austin: (71) Austin

of all the Fathers is howlden most pure in the

opinion of all. Finally Calvin thus writeth

Austin (72) only is sufficient, to shew the inde-

ment of the ancient Church.

Now in this next place let vs take a view

of what Religion S. Austin was, I mean

whether a Papist (as we are termed) or a

Protestant; and this euen from the writing

(71) Go- and Confessions of the Protestants them-

marus inelus.

And first, in prooffe that Gods foreknow-

Calu. Anst. l. 1. cap. 1. sect. 10.

doth not necessitate or restrayne the
 in her actions (contrary to the iudg-
 ment of most Protestants) *Saint Austin* is so (73) *Pol.*
 therein, that *Polanus* (73) (the Prote- in his
 ant) alledgeth several authorities out of *Sympho-*
Austin in defence thereof. *nia. c. 2.*

1. Touching the induration of *Pharoeh* hart p. 114
 God; *S. Austin* teacheth, that this was
 ly through *Permission*, and not through
 y *Positive* actual working of God; and
 therefore this Father is reprehended by *Cal-*
 in, saying, (74) *Austin* was not free from that (74) *Cal-*
 perdition, where he sayth, that *Induration* & *uin. l. 1.*
 ceration pertaine not to the working of God, *l. 2. c. 4.*
 to his foreknowledg. *sect. 3.*

2. *S. Austin* is so expresse and euident, that (75) *Me-*
 Gods Commandements are not impossible, that *lancthon.*
lancthon forbeareth not to confesse and *l. 2. Ep. p.*
 prehend (to vse his owne words.) *Imagi-* 290.
 tionem (75) *Augustini de impletione legis.* (76) *Da-*

3. *S. Austin* taught, that *Christ* from his *ponf. ad*
 activity was free from *Ignorance*; This is *Bellarmin.*
 assest by *Danens* (the great Protestant) *ad 2. Con-*
 these words: (76) *Austin. l. 2. c. 29. de pec.* trou. c. 1.
 of. denyeth *Christ* to haue taken *Childrens in-* p. 145.
 mities and ignorance, which to be false (with (77) *Bil-*

us of so great a man) *h* haue shewed before. son in his

That *Christ* after his Death descended in- Surury of
 Hell, Doctour (77) *Bilson* produceth te- *Christis*
 monies out of *S. Austin* in prooffe thereof, suffering.

4. That *Christ* penetrated the *Dores*, when pag. 616.
 came to his disciples; so as his body at & 398.
 at tyme was without all circumscrip- 399.

(78) *Ration*, (78) *Rungius* (the Protestant) affirmeth
 gius in it to be the doctrine of S. *Austin*.

disput. 11 7. That the Blessed *Virgin Mary* was assum-
 ex *Enst*. pted up into Heaven, according to the iudg-
 ad *Cov.* 1. ment of *Austin*, is confessed by the Centu-
 fol. 83. rists, who professing to set downe a Catalo-
 gue of Bookes written by S. *Austin*, do num-
 ber, and place among his other Bookes,

(79) *Centurione* *Virginis Mariae* l. 1.

sur. 3. c. 8. In like sort, the Centurists do alledge &
 10. col. confesse out of S. *Austin*, touching the Blef-
 1122a sed *Virgin* being free from Originall sinne, in

(80) *Centurione* this manner: As (80) touching Originall sinne,
 sur. 3. c. forasmuch as concerneth *Mary*, *Austin* writ-
 4. col. teth: Excepting the holy *Virgin Mary* of whom
 499. in honour of our Lord, when we treat of sinnes, I
 will have no question at all &c. This therefore
Virgin Mary excepted &c. Thus much do
 the Centurists alledge out of S. *Austin*.

9. That *Austin* taught, that the Blessed
Virgin vowed Chastity, is confessed by D.
 (81) *Enst* *Rally*, who most scornfully chargeth S. *Au-*
 against stin therein, with a Non (81) *sequitur*; saying,
 the *Rhe-* although S. *Austin* gathered, she vowed *Virgi-*
 nish Fe- nity, yet it followeth not &c.

flamens. 10. That the Scriptures are to be discerned
 in *Lua* c (so far as concerns our taking notice of the)
 1. by the authority of the Church, *Austin* most

(82) fully teacheth; and is therefore condemned
Swingl. by *Swingline* in these words: Here (82) I in-
 10m. a treat your indifferent judgments, that you free-
 fol. 132. ly speak, whether this saying of *Austin* (mean-

ning

ning about the discerning of Scripture by the authority of the Church be thought more audacious, then sitting; or to haue beene uttered imprudently.

11. Touching the Bookes of Toby, Iudith, Hester, Machabees, S. Austin doth admit them all for true diuine and Canonical Scripture, and for such his doing, is reprehended by Hospinian, (83) Zanchins, D. Fyeld, and (84) Hospinian. Doctor Reynolds.

12. S. Austin is so full for the Doctrine of his. Sacra Traditions, that they are to be receaued, as part. 1. p. 160. that M. Cartwright speaking of one Tradition, which Austin defended, thus bursteth out: To allow (84) S. Austins saying, is to bring de sacra in Popery againe; and further he thus speaking of S. Austin herein: If (85) S. Austins pag 321 judgment be a good iudgment, then there be some of 11. things Commanded of God, which are not in the D. Fyeld of the Scriptures; and thereupon no sufficient Doctrine Church. l. contained in the Scripture. 4. c. 21. p.

13. Touching the Sacraments conferring 448. D. Grace to the worthy Receauer, S. Austin for Reynolds teaching our Catholike Doctrine therein, in his is reprehended by (86) Luther and Calvin. conclu-

14. That Children could not be saued without being baptized, Cartwright thus speaketh nexed to of S. Austin herein: Austin (87) was of mind, his Con- that Children could not be saued without bap- ference.

S 4

tisme: conclus. a

pag. 700. (84) Cartwrights in M. Whitguists Defence. p. 101. (85) In Cartwrights his second Reply, part. 1. pag. 84. 85. 86. (86) Luth. l. contra Coeleum, and Calvin lib. Instit. 4. c. 14. sect. 16. (87) Cartwright in Whitguists defence, pag. 321,

(88) *supra*, p. 516. *tismo*: And hereupon then *Carrwright* chargeth *S. Austin* with *Absurdity* (88). Now in regard of this absolute Necessity of *Baptismo* to Children, B. 3. (89) confesseth, that *Austin* taught, that in case of necessity, it is lawfull for the Layty to baptize.

15. Touching the *Reall Presence*, taught by *S. Austin*, *Hospinian* (90) the Protestant, chargeth and reprehendeth *S. Austin* therefore; and particularly for these words of *S. Austin*: When (91) *Christ* said, *This is my body*, (90) *Hist.* then that his body was carryed in his hands.

Sacra- 16. That *Austin* taught, that the wicked men, par. (contrary to the Doctrine of the Protestants) did receave the *body of Christ*, is confessed, and reprehended by *Bucer*, in these words: How (92) often doth *Austin* write, that (91) *Aucen Judas* receaued the very body, and blood of *Him*, *our Lord*? Now further, that *Austin* taught, that the *Sacrament* ought to be taken *fasting*, is confessed by *Hospinian* in *Hist. Sacram. part. 1. pag. 48*. In like manner, that *Austin* taught, that *Holy bread* was to be given to the *Catechumeni*, *D. Fulke* confesseth, thus answering therto, terming it: A *superstitious bread*, giuen in *S. Austins* tyme to those that were *Catechumeni*, instead of the *Sacrament*. *Fulke* against *Heskins* &c. l. 3. c. 23. pag. 377. To passe further; that the *body of Christ*, in respect of his being in the *Sacrament*, is to be adored in the *Sacrament*, *D. Wilfon* reprehendeth *S. Austin* for such his Doctrine. *Wilfon* in his true difference. par. 4. pag. 536. To conclude,

clude, touching the B. Sacrament of the Eucharist, whereas S. Austin teacheth in tom. 3, in Enchirid. cap. 110. saying, *The Sacrifice of Christs body and blood is propitious, or an aila- ble for the soules in Purgatory*; this sentence being confessed by Hutterus (the Prote- stant) and in lieu of full answer thereto, he sayth: *In eternum defendi non potest: This say- ing of Austin can never be defended.* Hutterus l. de sacrificio Missatice l. 2. c. 7. p. 325.

17. S. Austin was so earnest in defence of Free will, and Univerſall Grace, that he is there- fore acknowledged, and dislyked by the (93) Cent. s. c. 4. col. Century (93) writers. The Centurists (94) & 900, & D. Whitaker do acknowledg, that Justifica- 501. tion by works, is in like manner taught by S. (94) Cent. Austin. tur. 5. col.

18. Touching the doctrine of merit of 10. col. works, thus writeth Osiander of S. Austin: *Au- 1131, and stin ſometimes in the Article of Justification, seemeth to attribute overmuch to the merit of ad Rem. Works* &c. Cent. 4. l. 4. cap. 23. Camp.

19. Touching Prayer for the Dead, thus D. rat. 2. pa. Fulke avoucheth: *Austin (95) defended prayer 11. for the dead.* And that S. Austin did hold (95) D. Purgatory, is in like manner confessed by Fulk, in (96) D. Fulk. confut. of Purg. pa. 349.

20. Touching Invocation of Saints, S. Au- 349. stin is so fully Catholike, that himselfe (96) Fulk doubteth not to pray to S. Cyprian, being ib. pa. 78. long before martyred: which action Kemp- (97) Exa. nius thus reprehendeth: (97) *Austin did this par. 3. pa. without Scripture, yielding to the tyme and cu- 211, stoms.* In

(98) Sa-
cram.
part. 2. l.
3. c. 8.

21. In prooffe, that *Images may be worship-
ped*, *Hospinian* (98) though a Protestant, yet
agreeing with *S. Austin* herein, alledgeth
him in prooffe hereof.

22. Touching the *fast of Lent*, and other
fasts, *S. Austin* is reprehended by the *Centu-
rist*, *Cent. 3. c. 6. col. 686. 687.*

(99) Cent.
3. col. 710

23. Touching *vowing of Monasticall life*,
the *Centurists* (99) charge *S. Austin* with the
Doctrine thereof, and *Hospinian* thus writ-
teth of *Austin* herein: *Austin* (100) was a
great lover of *Monasticall profession*, according
to the custome of that age.

(100)
Hosp. de
origins
Monach.
fol. 33.

To conclude this long *Animadversion*,
Austin taught, that *Antichrist* should be but
one only man (and that therefore the Popes
being many, cannot be truly accounted *An-
tichrist*) this is confessed and dislyked by
the (101) *Centurists*. Thus farre now of this
passage; from whence we may conclude, that
that Father, to whom so many learned Pro-
testants did aboue giue so high commenda-
tion and praise, was in all poynts of our Ca-
tholike Roman Religiō (euen by the ack-
nowledgment of the Protestants) an entyre
Roman Catholike, or Papist; and hereupon
I referre to the iudgement of any man, care-
full of his saluation; whether it be not more
seecure, for one to range himselfe in faith &
Religion, with so worthy a member of
Christis Church, as *Austin* was (euen in the
confession of our Aduersaryes, who not-
withstanding their Diuersity of Religion
from

(101)
Cent. 2. l.
2. col. 435

from him, euen in relating of his Catholike Doctrines, for the most part do giue him the tytle of Saint) then to dissent from him in fayth, and to ioyne himselfe in Religion with the Innouatours of these times.

Animaduerſion CLXIII.

I Grant, that certaine Fathers forbearing ſomtymes vpon iuſt reaſons, though at other tymes they are moſt cleare therein, do not ſpeake ſo plainly of the *Real Preſence*; but that ſome of their ſayings might ſtand ſubiect to miſtaking, to ſuch as conceaue not the true reaſon of their affected obſcurity in wryting: Yet cannot the Proteſtants with any ſhew of integrity, inſiſt in ſuch darke Sayings. My reaſon is this: For vpon the ſame ground I bouldly affirme, that we may with better reaſon inſiſt in the ſayings of the Proteſtants deliuered in ſhew, in defence of the *Real Preſence*; ſeing many more, and more plaine ſeeming ſayings may be alledged out of Calvin, Beza, and their followers in pretended prooſe of our Catholike Doctine of the *Real Preſence*, then our Aduerſaries can alledge againſt it, out of all the Fathers. For Exauple; Calvin thus ſaith: (1) *Eſt autem incredibile videtur &c.* Although it may ſeeme incredible, that in ſo great a diſtance of places (as of Heauen, and earth) the ſhadow of Chriſt ſhould penetrate vnto vs, that it may be meate for vs; we muſt yet remember, how much aboue all our ſenſes, the ſecret power of the holy Ghoſt

(1) Calvin
inſiſt
2. c. 17.
ſect. 10.

(1) So
saith Be-
za with
other
Duties
of Gene-
ua, in
their A-
pologia
modesta,
ad Acta
Commun-
is, 15.
printed
Geneve.
1575.

(1) Cal-
uinists,
in D. Co-
nell, in
his de-
fence of
M. Hoo-
ker, 21.
24. p. 96.
D. Bilson
in his
true dis-
ference
etc. par.
4. p. 539.
C. 192.
C. 168.
D. Wbi-

lak. contra Com. par. 9. besides other Calvinists.

Ghost can shew it selfe. Beza sayth: (2) Our manner of the presence of Christs body is a more admirable and euident testimony of the Divine Omnipotency, then that reall, and orall manducation of the Papists. Finally to omit many other such sayings of our Aduersaries, D. Falske thus hath left written: *The Creatures, or Elements are blessed or consecrated, that by the working of Gods spirit, they should be changed into the Body and Bloud of Christ, after a diuine and spirituall manner to the worthy recea-uer.* Now here I demand, will our Aduersaries insist in some darke sayings of the Fathers, for the impugning of Christs reall and true body and bloud in the *Eucharist*? Then I auer, we may (with more shew of colour) urge the Protestants Testimonies, euen in defence and prooffe of the *Reall Presence*. I add to this former Animaduersion (a thing most worthy of obseruation) that all such Sectaries, as denied the *Reall presence* before *Luthers* dayes, did maintaine diuers Heresies (for such confessed both by Catholiks, and Protestants:) Now the men impugning the *Reall Presence* were these following, *Berengarius, Waldenses, Albigenses, Henry Bruns, Peter Abaylardus, Aluericus*, and lastly *Wicleff*, all maintayners of diuers Hereticall positions and opinions, in the censure both of our Aduersaries, and our selues.

Ani.

Animaduerſion CLXIV.

Both the (3) *Caluinists* and *Lutherans* (4) (4) *Lu-*
reach, that the *Godhead*, *Chriſt Paſſion*, & *therans*,
the *Sacraments* concur in their degrees in *as Kemp-*
working of *Grace*; The *Godhead*, as being the *nitins in*
Principall Agent, and without diſhonour to *his exam.*
Chriſt Paſſion; *Chriſt Paſſion*, as being the *part. 2. p.*
Instrument conioyned to the *Godhead*, and: *17. 6. p.*
working without diſhonour thereto. Laſt- *31. Lobec-*
ly, the *Sacraments*, as being the *ſeparated Ju-* *chius in*
ſtruments, conferring *Grace* truly, & in their *his diſ-*
kind, by power & vertue from the *Godhead* *put at.*
and *Chriſt Paſſion*, and this without diſho- *Tbaol. p.*
nour to either. Now then I here vrge, that if *13. 112.*
our Aduerſaries do truly, and according to *and di-*
the Scriptures acknowledg thus much due *uers o-*
to the *Sacraments*, and without iniury to *thers.*
Chriſts Paſſion; why then ſhould not the
doctrin of the *Maſſe*, and *Sacrifice*, (being
grounded vpon euident Scriptures) be hol-
den freed from all imputation of being diſ-
honorable vnto *Chriſt*, or his *Paſſion*? and
yet this is one mayne obiection vrged by
our Aduerſaries, againſt the B. *Sacrifice* of
the *Maſſe*. Therefore I conclude, that as the
Sacrifices (5) for linne, and other *Sacrifices* of (5) *Exod.*
the *Old Teſtament* receaued their force from *29. 16.*
Chriſts death, and *Sacrifice* of the *Croſſe* *Leuit. 7.*
then to come, and without all diſhonour *Num. 18.*
thereto; So likewise in the *New Teſtament*, &c.
(which is (6) *eſtabliſhed in better promiſſes*) (6) *Hebr.*
pur now *Sacrifice* of the *Maſſe* doth (with-
8.

out any dishonour to *Christ*) confer more abundant efficacy and vertue, from his said death and *Passion*, now past.

Animaduerſion CLXV.

WHen the *Fathers* ioynly teach, that the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* is a true *Sacrifice*, our Aduerſaries labour to auoyde their authorities ſeueral wayes, but all in vayne. Firſt they ſay, it may be termed a *Sacrifice*, in that the prayers, and the exerciſe of *Fayth*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, being vied in the celebration of this Sacrament, are ſpiritual *Sacrifices* to God. But this anſwere auayleth nothing; in that the ancient *Fathers* plainly teach, that the body and blood of *Chriſt* is the *Sacrifice*, which is offered vp in the Church.

(7) *Ambroſe*, in *Psalm. 38*.
(8) See hereof the Councell of *Nice*, *Jerome Epiſt. ad Euegrum*, *Tertull. l. de uoluntis*
As for example, *Ambroſe* ſayth: *Eiſi (7) Chriſtus nunc non videtur offerre, tamen ipſe offeratur in terris cum corpore eius offertur*. Againe, the *Fathers* teach, that only *Prieſts* (and no others) can offer vp this *Sacrifice*; but it is manifeſt, that *Prayers*, *Lauds*, *Exerciſe* of *fayth*, *hope*, and *charity* may (as ſpiritual *Sacrifices*) be offered vp by any Man, or Woman. Our Aduerſaries further reply, & ſay, that the *Eucharist* may be called a *Sacrifice*, becauſe it includeth in it ſelfe a certaine commemoration, or representation of a true *Sacrifice*, to wit, of the death of *Chriſt*. We hereto ſay, that it is true, that the Action of the *Eucharist* is a ſimilitude or memoriall of the *Sacrifice* of the *Croſſe*; yet hence

hence it followeth not, that the *Fathers* thought not, that a true & proper sacrifice was offered vp in the celebration of the *Eucharist*; First because *Baptisme* is a sacrament, representing the death of Christ (as the Apostle Rom. 6. teacheth) & yet no one Father doth tearme *Baptisme*, a Sacrifice. Secondly, The *Fathers* do often adioyne certaine *Epithets*, peculiar only to a true Sacrifice; as *Chrysostome* calleth it, *Sacrificium verum, & plenum horroris*. But these Adiuncts are fondly giuen to a mere representiue Sacrifice. Thirdly, the *Fathers* do often vie the words, *Victima* (9) & *Sacrificium*, in the (9) Singular number; But this phraze of speech is *Cyprian*, most improper, if it should be vnderstood of the *Eucharist*, as it is only a commemoration of the death of Christ; For since only one thing is here represented, therefore the name thereof is to be deliuered only in the singular number.

Animaduersion CXLVI.

IN like manner where we read, that the *Fathers* do ascribe great reuerence to the *Eucharist*; to wit, either of *Adoration*, or *Inuocation*, or in any other sort: To this *Peter Martyr* (10) and others do answer: that if any such reuerence was exhibited by the *Fathers* to the *Eucharist*, this reuerence was not terminated in the *Eucharist* it selfe, but directed to *Christ*, signified therein, and so by the mediation of those earthly elements trans-

(10) *Peter Martyr* lib. contra Gardin. part. 1. obit. 150.

transferred vnto him : No otherwyse then when the *Papists* (for thus do they particularly instance) praying before *Images*, do not their prayers to the *Images*, but to *Christ*, the *Saint* represented therein. But against *Euation* I first aske, what secret intelligence haue our *Aduersaryes* with the *Fathers* intention herein, since the *Fathers* words giue not the least intimation thereof? Secondly I say, that (11) *Dionysius* doth inuoke the *Sacrament* it selfe, and not *Christ* only before the *Sacrament*. Thirdly, this their swear (admitting it for true) doth waite euen, in their iudgements, the *Catholics* praying before *Images*, and the reuerence giuen to them; which *Doctrine* the *Protestants* do so much inueigh against.

(11) *L. de Hierarch Ecclie. c. 3. part. 3. saying. O Diuinitifimum & Sacrosanctum Sacram. &c.*

Animaduersion CLXVII.

THE *Scripture* is most difficult for three respects; First, in regard of its multiplicity of the *Senses* of one and the same passage of *Scripture*. Secondly, in respect of the place wherein the *Scripture* is deliuered. Thirdly, by reason of the height of the subject, wherein the *Scripture* intreateth. To touch all this briefly: First concerning the *Sense*; There are in diuers passages of *Scripture*, three verall senses besydes the literall, all intended by the *Holy Ghost*. The senses are called, *Allegoricus*, *Tropologicus*, and *Anagogicus*. Now how shall an ignorant man know, what texts of *Scripture* be capable of all these

of them? The *Style* of the *Scripture* is
 difficult, as being stored with figures,
Allegories, and full of Hebrew phrases,
Dialects, as appeareth in perusing the
Isaiah, and the *Apocalyps*. The *subject* of the
Scripture is most high, as discoursing of the
 creation of the world of Nothing, of the
 mysteries of the *Trinity*, and the *Incarnati-*
 on, besides many other *Dogmatical* points,
 transcending the light of mans naturall
 apprehension: And therefore *S. Ambrose* had
 good cause thus to pronounce of the holy
Scripture: *Marc* (12) *est scriptura Divina, ha-* (12) *Am*
in se sensus profundos. Ad hereto that the *bros. Ep.*
Scripture hath to an ignorant eye diuers see- 44. ad
 ing contrarieties, though in theselues they *Constan-*
 are most true, and reconcilable. For exam- *tium.*
 ple, these two texts (13): *Filius non portabit* (13) *Ezec.*
iniquitatem patris; anima, quae peccauerit, ipsa 18.
trahitur. And this other: *Visitans* (14) *1ui.*
iniquitatem patrum in filios, in tertiam & quartam (14) *E.*
generationem; how can an ignorant man, or *rod. 294*
 a man reconcile these passages? And what
 unity then may one discern in a Merchant-
 fellow, or lilly woman, (who can only
 read) carrying the bible vnder their
 arme to the Church, and vaunting of the
 lines of the *Scripture*; and auerring, that
 themselves are able to vnfold & expound
 the most abstrusest passages there? O pride,
 & ignorance! Ad finally, that in the *Script-*
 ure the plural number is sometimes vsed for
 the singular number; as *Marc. 15.* we read;

T

as they

they that were crucified with him, rayled at him
and yet we know, it was but only one of the
thieves that did so, the good thiefe hono-
ring our Sauour. See the like hereto tou-
ching this kynd of phraze of the Scripture
(besydes other places) in Hebr. 7. Againe
the Scripture in diuers texts doth vnderstand
by the word, *Omnis*, only *quidam*. For ex-
ample in Math. 27. we reade: *dicunt omnes*
vt crucifigatur, and yet the B. Virgin, S. Ma-
gdaelen, the Apostles, and diuers others did
not so cry out against our Sauour. The like
phraze is in those words: *Omnies, quae sunt,*
querunt, Philip. 2. & yet the Apostles
and many other good Christians were ex-
empted out of this sentence. But now heere
I demand, how can an vnlearned man
concile these, and the like sentences with
the true meaning of the Holy Ghost in the
Scripture?

Animaduersion CLXVIII.

THE Catholike Church deliuereth cer-
taine Rules, for the more perfect know-
ledg of true Traditions. The first. When the
vniuersall Church doth embrace any doctrine
as a point of sayth, the which is not found in the
holy Scriptures, it is necessary to say, that the
point proceedeth from the Tradition of the Apo-
stles. The reason hereof is, in that the vni-
uersall Church, as being the (1) pillar and foun-
dation of truth cannot erre: And therefore
what the Church belieueth to be of sayth

(1) 1. Ti-
moteus. 3.

the same doubtlesly is of sayth: But no
 int or Article is of sayth, but what God
 hath reuealed either by the Apostles, or Pro-
 phets; since at this present the Church is not
 gurned with new Reuelations.

The second. *When the vniuersall Church*
do obserue any thing, which not any, but only
had power to institute, and yet which is not
written in the Scripture; the same we are
to presume to be deliuered from Christ and his
Apostles; the reason hereof is like to the rea-
son of the former Rule; to wit, in that the
vniuersall Church cannot erre either in belie-
ving, or in working; especially if the wor-
king doth concerne any rite of diuine wor-
ship. And such is the Baptisme of Infants.

The third. *That, which is obserued through-*
out the vniuersall Church, and cannot find any
institution thereof in the most ancient tymes,
same we are to belicue, that it was first ordain-
ed by the Apostles, though it be of that nature,
that the Church had power first to ordayne it:
this is the rule of (2) S. Austin. The first of (1) Lib.
may be an example hereof: For this said 4 contra
might haue been instituted by the Church, Donat.
Christ, or his Apostles had not afore insti- cap. 24.
tuted it; Yet we maintayne, that it was insti-
tuted by Christ, or his Apostles, because al-
luding vp to higher tymes, and seeking af-
ter the first Origen thereof, we find no be-
ginning thereof, but only in the tyme of
Apostles.

The fourth. *When all the Doctours of the*
Church

Church being gathered together, either in a generall Council, or in their severall writings and bookes) do teach with a common consent, that such, or such a point, descendeth from Apostolicall Tradition, we are to believe, that it is an Apostolicall Tradition. The reason of this rule is, because if all the Doctors of the Church should erre, then followeth it, that the whole Church should erre, since she is obliged to follow her Pastours and Doctours. Now where we speake of the *Fathers*, touching any point in their severall writings, here we are to vnderstand, that we hold it not necessary, that all the *Fathers* should write thereof; but it is sufficient, if some *Fathers* of the chiefest note and eminency do expressly affirme the point in writing; and that other *Fathers* do not contradict them therein, taking notice of such their writings. Here we say, it is most probable, that such is the common iudgment of all the *Fathers* therein; since it hath beene ever obserued, that when any one of the ancient *Fathers* hath erred, in a matter of weight and importance, that the same Father was ever contradicted by diuers others.

The fifth. That doubtlesly is to be believed to descend from Apostolicall Tradition, which hath beene holden for such in those Churches, in which Churches there hath beene an entyre and continuall succession from the Apostles: This rule is deliuered by (4) *Irenaeus*, and (5) *Tertullian*. The reason of this rule is, because the

(4) *Irenaeus*. l. 3. cap. 1.
(5) *Tertullian*. lib. de praescript.

Apostles

Apostles did deliuer to their Successours
(with the Episcopall gouernment) the true
doctrine also of Religion. Thus far tou-
ching the Rules for the better discerning of
Apostolicall Traditions.

Animaduerſion CLXIX.

T Ouching Prayer in a strange tongue, Cal-
uin and other Sectaries wholly dislike
it, because that Prayer being not vnder-
stood by the Ignorant people, no profit
(say they) comes thereby to the people.
But this is false; seeing the Prayer of the
Church is not made to the people, but to
God for the people; Therefore it is not ne-
cessarily conducing to the Spirituall profit
of the people, that they vnderstand the
prayer, but it is sufficient, if God vnderstand
it: Euen as if one should petition to the king
in the Latin tongue, in behalfe of some ru-
stic and ignorant man; doubtlesly this ig-
norant man might receaue profit thereby,
although he did not vnderstand the peti-
tion, or Prayer of his Advocate.

Furthermore, the Church prayeth not in
vayne for the faythfull being abſent, & for
other Sinners; How much more then doth
the Church pray in vayne for the fayth-
full being present, and desiring, that they
may be prayed for in their Necessities?

But to proccede: The ignorant people
may not only receaue profit from the Prayer
of another, though they do not vnderstand

(6) L 9.
Doctri-
ne Chri-
stian ca.
9.

it; but also euen from that *Prayer*, where
themselues do powre out to *God*, though
they do not vnderstand it. This point
thus proued: The *Jewes* (according to
opinion of (6) *S. Austin*) did not in vaine
worship *God* in *Figures*, and diuers *Ceremo-*
nies; although diuers of the *Jewes* did
vnderstand the signification and meaning
of the said *Figures* and *Ceremonies*, then
ignorant people do vnderstand *Latin Prayer*.
Again, if it be necessary for all those who
pray to *God*, or prayse and honour him
Hymnes, to vnderstand what they say, then
very few, or none at all would be found
who should without tinne recite or sing
Psalmes of David, and the *Prophets*, or should
read the *Apostles* in diuine prayer; Since
man cannot be named, who vnderstandeth
the true intended sense of the *Psalms*,
Prophets, and the *Apostles*: Neither are there
two places of Scripture (so much vrged by
our Aduersaries) repugnant to what is here
said: *Populus* (7) *hic labijs me honorat* &c.
And againe: *Yff pray* (8) *with the tongue*,
spirit prayeth, but my vnderstanding is without
fruite. Since the first of these texts is not
vnderstood of *Prayer*, or of reading diuine
Scripture, but it is meant of those, who profess
piety with their tongue, and in words; say-
ing they loue *God*, but yet do the contrary
in their Actions, as (9) *Serome* and (10) *Au-*
gustin do expound. But admitting the words
of this text to be vnderstood of Men pray-

(7) Mat.
25.
(8) 1.
Cor. 14.
(9) Ro-
me in
c. 19.
Isa.
(10) Au-
stin in
lib. 22.
contra
Faustum
cap. 35.

the may we answere that those are here
 , those who are reprehended, who praying in a knowne and
 point of tongue, beare (during the tyme of
 ing to praying) no intention to what they
 in vain, but suffer at that present great distra-
 Cerebration, and euagation of thoughts. Concer-
 did long this later passage of *Scripture*, I an-
 swere, that that *Prayer* is not reprehended,
 which is not vnderstood; but only that
Prayer is preferred before it, which is vnder-
 stood. For the *Apostle* sayth not, that the
 prayer is without fruite; but that the mind
 y, the vnderstanding is without fruite, in that
 found is not instructed thereby. Now that this
 thing of *Praying* is not reprehended by the
Apostle, as Euill, or altogether fruitles and
 unprofitable, appeareth from those words a
 little after following: *For thou indeed giuest*
thanks well &c.

Animaduerſion CLXX.

If *Christ* and his *Apostles* had determined
 to restrayne the word of God, only to
 the *Scripture*; then it followeth, that *Christ*
 would openly haue commanded a thing of
 great moment, and the *Apostles* would
 in some one place, or other of *Scip-*
 ture haue testified, that they did write by
 the commandement of our Lord, as they
 taught throughout the world (as is recor-
 ded in *Scripture*) by the commandement
 of our Lord; But this commandement of
 writing, to be imposed by *Christ* vpon his

Apostles, we read not in any place of *Scripture*. Furthermore the *Apostles* did not precept, or stay for any proffered occasion to preach the *Gospell* *in a voice*; but they undertake the charge of preaching the *Gospell* freely and of their owne accord and disposition; Whereby to write the *Scripture* they were moued thereto through a certain kind of Necessity, and vrging occurrence.

- (11) *Lib. 3. hist. eccl.* Thus *S. Mathew* (as *Eusebius* (11) recordeth) did write vpon occasion; because when he had preached to the *Iewes*, and determined to goe to the *Gentills* he deemed it to be conuenient and profitable, to leave behind him to those, some memoriall of his doctrine and preaching, from whom his body and corporall presence he had departed.
- (12) *L. 2. hist. eccl. cap. 35.* *S. Marke* (as the same *Eusebius* (12) recordeth) did write his *Gospell*, neither of his owne accord, nor by the commandement of *S. Peter* (whose disciple he was) but only through the forcible persuation of the *Romanes*.
- (13) *Euseb. lib. 4. 3. hist. eccl.* *S. Luke* (as also (13) *Eusebius* sheweth) was only moued to write his *Gospell*, because he saw many other men rashly presuming to write the life and actions of *Christ*, which themselves did not perfectly know. And therefore *S. Luke* did write, thereby to withdraw vs from the vncertaine relation of others.

- (14) *Euseb. lib. 5. 1. supra.* *S. Iohn* (as *Eusebius* (14) affirmeth) did preach the *Gospell* without committing it to wryting, even to his old & decrepit age.

(15) S. Jerome sayth, that at length he was (16) compelled (as it were) by the Bishops of Rome, to write his Gospell, by reason of the Heresy of the Ebionites then beginning. Therefore except the Heresy of the Ebionites were not then begunne to spring up, perhaps he should not at all haue had the Gospell of John; neither perhaps the other three Gospells, but in regard of the foresaid occasions in those tymes occurring. Now from this it is euident, that the wayne inclination of the Apostles was not to wryte Gospells, but to preach it. Furthermore to learne, that they had determined to commit their doctrine to wryting, they would haue made some Catechisme therof, or some such like booke; But they did wryte either a Gospell (as the Euangelists did) or Epistles on some speciall occasion, as Peter, Paul, Iudas, Iohn; and in the same did discourse of dogmaticall points of the Faith, only obiter, and as circumstances inuened them.

Animaduersion CLXXI.

The first Proposition touching Indulgence. The foundation and groundworke of the Doctrine of Indulgences is, that there is in the Church of Christ, a certaine spirituall Treasury of the satisfactions of Christ and his Saints, which may be applied to those, who stand subiect to temporal punishment, after the guilt of eternall punishment.

ment is remitted in the Sacrament of Penitence; for the better explicating of which doctrine, these following propositions are to be deliuered.

The first proposition. *In one and the same good action or worke of a iust man, a double price or value is assigned to it: the one of Merit, the other of Satisfaction.* For example; the one and same act of giuing of Almes, is *Satisfactory*, in that it is a laborious, or penall worke. It is also *Meritorious*; because it is a good worke, proceeding from Charity. Now the giuing of Almes proceeding from charity, is not lesse good, because it is laborious and penall; vpon the same reason then it followeth, that the same prayer may be both *impetratory*, and *meritorious*.

The second Proposition. *A good worke, in that respect, as it is meritorious, cannot be applyed to another; but it may be applyed, as it is Satisfactory.* The first part of this proposition is proued, because it cannot come to passe, that in respect that one doth worke well, another should be said to worke well in the said Action. The second part is proued, because satisfaction is a compensation of the punishment, or paying of what is due; but it is euident, that one man may make compensation of punishment for another man, or pay the debt of another man.

The third Proposition. *There remaineth in the Church an infinit Treasury of Christs satisfactions, which can neuer be exhausted or dryed*

This is evident, since the passion of Christ
 of an infinite worth, price, and dignity;
 it was the Passion of an infinite Person
 wit, of the Word Incarnated; for he was
 who shed his blood for the Church,
 did shed it in Mans flesh Hypostatical-
 assumed. Now the dignity of satisfac-
 tion receaues its measure from the dignity
 of the person satisfying; euen as the great-
 ness of the offence taketh its proportion
 from the dignity of the person offended.
 Therefore from hence it is inferred, that
 there is yet remayning a great part of the
 worth and price of the Passion of Christ,
 which may alwayes be applied to Man.

The fourth proposition. *To this super-
 abundant Treasury of the satisfactions of Christ,
 the passions or sufferings of the B. Virgin,
 and such other Saints, who haue suffered more
 as it is in this world then their sins haue deserved. For
 it is evident (not to speake of other Saints)
 that the Blessed Virgin neuer committed any
 small Sinne; & yet it is said, that the sword
 of griefe pierced her soule, Luc. 2. In like sort,
 Iohn Baptist (being sanctified in his mo-
 thers wombe) did lead a most innocent life,
 and stood obnoxious to most few, and most
 light or small Sinnes; and yet in defence of
 the truth hee was beheaded. Therefore it
 cannot be doubted, but that a great heape
 of passions and sufferings of the B. Virgin, &
 of S. Iohn Baptist were vpon their deaths re-
 mayning, of which themselues did not stand*

in need, for the satisfying for any temporal punishment. All which superabundance of satisfactions were layed vp in the Treasury house of the Church. Thus farre of this poynt; only I add, that so the person may be capable of *Indulgences* two things are required. The first, that he be in state of Grace; the second, that he performe all that, which is inioyned to him, for the obtaining of the *Indulgence*.

Animaduerſion CLXXII.

WHen it is said: *Indulgences* do profit the soules of the departed, only *per modum ſuffragij*, the meaning hereof is, because *Indulgences* do not profit the departed by way of *Iuridicall abſolution*, but by way of ſolution or payment; that is, by way of *Satisfaction*. Thus when a Man giueth Almes, or faſteth, or goeth on pilgrimage to holy places, for the reliefe of a ſoule departed, he doth not abſolute that ſoule from the guilt of punishment; but he only offereth vp that ſatisfaction, that God accepting thereof, would free and deliuer it from the due punishment, which otherwiſe it were to ſuffer. Euen ſo the Pope doth not abſolute the departed ſoule, but out of the Treasury of ſatisfactions remainyng in the Church, offereth vp ſo much to God, as is needfull to free and deliuer the ſoule. For the cloſe of theſe *Animaduerſions*, touching the Doctrine of *Indulgences*, the Reader is to take particular notice

notice (and the rather through the wilfull
malitious mistaking of our Aduersaries;
who do mightily calumniate vs in this que-
tion of *Indulgences*;) that we teach, the
guilt of eternall damnation being remitted
only by the Sacrament of *Confession*, or by
most perfect contrition in lieu thereof, when
there is not oportunitie of the other, the
subiect of an *Indulgence* is only a *temporall*
punishment, due to be suffered (after the
guilt of damnation is remitted) which *tem-
porall punishment* by meanes of *Indulgences*,
we hold may be either lessened, or wholly
taken away in a Man, who is in state of
Grace, but not if he be in state of *Mortall*
sinne.

Animaduerſion CLXXIII.

[T is certaine, that the English *Translation*
of the *New Testament* made by the Prote-
stants are most corrupt, and in diuers places
most different from the *Greeke*; in which
tongue either all, or most of the *New Testa-
ment* was first written. I will exemplify in
two passages: The *New Testament* makes
mention of good or pious Traditions, &
of wicked and Iewish Traditions, expres-
sing them both by one & the same Greeke
word, to wit, *paradires*, which properly sig-
nifyeth *Traditio*. Now the imposture here
resteth: For our English Protestant Tran-
slations in such Texts, wherein are vnder-
stood Good and profitable Traditions, as
in

in 1. Cor. 2. and 2. Theff. 2. do translate instead of the word *Traditions*, the word *Ornaments*. But where the Texts speake of wicked and *frivolous Traditions*, there our Adversaries put downe most punctually (as in Math. 15.) in their Translation, the right word, *Traditions*. Now this calumny is viced in dislike of *Apostolicall Traditions*, that for the ignorant Reader should neuer find the word, *Tradition*, in Scripture, in a good sense, but alwayes in a bad and disallowed; though now in their last Translation (but not in any former) for the better saluing of their credit, they put only in the Margent of such Texts, speaking of godly Traditions, the word *Traditions*. The like course they hould in translating the Greeke word, ἀξίος, signifying, *dignus*, in English, *Worthy*; and the Verbe ἀξιῶνται, *to be made worthy*. For in those Texts, which concerne *Merit of works* (as in Luc. 20. and 21. & 2. Theff. 1.) wherein those said words are vsed, they translate them, *To seeme to be worthy, or to seeme only to be made worthy*; thereby to weaken such texts for the prouing of *Merit of works*. But in other Texts, not touching the *Doctrine of Merit*, they can be content to translate those words truly; that is, *to be worthy, and to be worthy indeed*; as in this

(*) Heb. Text: *O how (*) much sorer punishment shall he be worthy of, who treadeth under foot the Sonne of God.* Thus much for a Tast.

(*) Heb.
20.

Animaduerſion CLXXIV.

He English Protestant Translation of the Bible is not only by the Catholiks acknowledged to be corrupt and impure, but also by many Protestant themselves. Mr. Burges thus censureth of that Translation, (17) *M. saying: How (17) shall I approue vnder my hād Burges Translation, which hath many omissions, many in his additions, which sometymes obscureth, sometymes Apolo- peruerieth the sense; being sometymes senseles, & fact. & sometymes contrary? To whose Iudgment herein subscribe diuers Ministers in their joint consent thereof in these words: A (18) The Translation, that taketh away from the Text, ministers in their abridg- ment of a Booke deliuered to King Iames. pag. 12. & 13.* that addeth to the Text, and this sometymes to the changing or obscuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghost. And againe: *A Translation, which is absurd and senseles, peruerieth in many places the meaning of the Holy Ghost. All whose Cen- sures herein agree with the like censure of D. Reynolds, deliuered in King Iames his pre- sence in Hampton Court; who refused to sub- scribe to the Communion booke; because (said he) it warranted a false & corrupt translation of the Bible. Now from hence I thus deduce: The Protestants by their owne Confessiōs haue had as yet neuer any true English Tran- slation of the Scriptures: Therefore as yee the English Protestants neuer enioyed (ac- cording to their owne Principles) a suffi- cient and competent Iudge of Controuer- sies; Since admitting the Scripture were the sole*

sole Iudge of Controuerfies in fayth; yet this of neceffity muft be vaderftood of the *Scripture*, as it is pure, and incorrupt, & not as it is impure, and abaftarded with falfe *Translations*.

From the *Scripture*, I will descend to the *English Communion booke*, or *Booke of Common Prayer*. This *Communion booke* (as it is euen at this present) we fynd to be thus condemned by Protestants. Twenty two preachers in *London* in (19) one *Petition*, did thus charge the *Common-Prayer Booke*, say-

(19) *The Booke* it intituled, *The Petition* of *Ministers in Lon- don*.
 (20) *D. Couell in his Exercimen.* pag. 179.
 thus charge the *Common-Prayer Booke*, saying: Many things in the *Communion Booke* are repugnant to the word of God. And againe: In the *Communion Booke* there be things, of which there is no reasonable sense; There is contradiction in it, as in necessary and essentiall points of Religion; The holy *Scripture* is disgraced byt. A point so euident, that *D. Couell* rebuketh and censureth other Protestants herein, saying: The (20) *Communion Booke* is boldly despised (meaning by the Puritans;) *Grosse errors and manifest impieties* (meaning in their opinion) are in the *Communion Booke*. So he redargueth his owne brethren. Now, hereinlike manner (as aboue) I do thus argue: Yf the *English Protestants* haue had no forme of *Common Prayer* published to them, but such as is repugnant to the *Scripture*, and in which there is contradiction; euen in the necessary points of Religion; then followeth, that euen to this day the ignorant *English Protestant* neuer prayed

to God auayleably; For it is Prayer, sort-
ing to the word of God, and not what is ac-
companied with errours, which is piercing
in Gods eares. See here what dangerous Re-
sultancies proceed to the English Prote-
stants from their own Brethrens Confessions
(though most true) that as yet they enioy
not the Scripture as truly translated, nor a
pious set forme of Prayer, or Communion
Booke.

Animaduerſion CLXXV.

Seeing we, who professe the Roman reli-
gion, are commonly (yea often euen by
our Aduersaries) called *Catholikes*, therfore
I will here briefly shew, by laying open the
Antiquity of that Title, how much we are
honored by being so styled; whereas other
falte Doctrines commonly take their De-
nomination from the first Authour there-
of, or from the Doctrine it selfe. Well then,
(21) Cyrill thus writeth hereof: *Si ueris in a-*
liquam urbem &c. If thou shalt goe into any
City, thou demandest not, what is the Church
or house of God, for euen the Heretikes say, they
haue the house of God, & the Church; sed petas,
ubi sit Catholica Ecclesia &c. quasi dicas, si hoc
petas, nullus Hereticorum suam Ecclesiam osten-
det: But thou demandest, where the Catholike
Church is, for that name is peculiar to this holy
Church, the mother of vs all, as if thou shouldest
say, if thou demandest this, no Heretike will
show to thee his Church.

(21) Cy-
ril. Cate-
ch. 18.

(11) *In*
Epist. ad
Sympro-
mianum,
quæ est
de No-
mine Ca-
tholico.

(11) *Cbry-*
sof. hom.
31. in
Acta.
post ol.

(14) *Ho-*
mil. 31. in
Acta.

Pacianus. Christianus (22) *mibi nomen est,*
Catholicus vero cognomen, illud me nuncupat,
istud me ostendit; A Christian is my Name, &
Catholike my surname; by the former I am na-
med, by this other I am knowne, or discerned.
And againe: Catholicum istud nec Marcionem,
nec Apellem &c. This Name (Catholike) nei-
ther doth it sound or meane Marcion, or Apelles,
or Montanus; nec hereticos sumit authores; nei-
ther doth it admit any Hereticall Authours.
Now on the other syde, how Heresies and
their Professours take their appellation,
this one testimony of Chrysostome (for grea-
ter breuity) shall serue: Illi habent (23) *quos-*
dam, à quibus appellantur; prout enim Heresi-
archæ nomen, ita & secta vocatur &c. Those men
(meaning Heretikes) haue some men, from
whom they take their Names; for as the Name of
the Arch. Heretike is, so is the sect called. Which
saying we find verified euen at this day, by
the words, Lutheran, Swinglian, Calvinist
&c. Now whereas our Aduersaries by way
of retortion call vs, Papists; To this I an-
were (as is aboue in this Treatise touched)
that this word Papist, is not deriued from
any knowne Authour or Arch. Heretike, as
the words Lutheran, Swinglian, Calvinist &c.
but from the Pope, and such was S. Peter, yea
Christ himself. Add hereto that (24) *Chry-*
sofome (as if it were by way of foreseeing
we should be called Papists) sayth; It is not
hurtfull, if Catholicus be called by the name of
those, who gouerne the Church in the name of
Christ,

Christ, so that they receive not their name from any particular man, as Heretikes are named: Thus S. Chrysostome. To conclude, it is to be obserued, that we are called *Papists*, only by the *Lutherans* in *Germany*, and *Heretikes* in some neere Countreyes; but we are not so called (to omit *Italy*, and *Spain*, in *Greece*, *Asia*, *Affrike*, or in the *Jndyes*.

Animaduerſion C L X X V I.

¶ Though the many Controuersyes (agitated betweene the *Catholikes* & the *Protestants*) afford a most conuincing Argument, that both the partyes during their continuance of such their contrary beliefes, cannot expect saluation; yet this point is made more demonstrable, if we insist only in such controuersyes betwene our Adversaries and vs, the subiect of which are taught by the one syde to be (vnder *Christ*) the immediate meanes of our grace & saluation; and denyed by the other party to be of such force and efficacy for the soules euerlasting Good; and consequently in regard of their subiect, are one way necessarily to be believed. So as if it be shewed, that the *Catholikes*, and the *Protestants* do mainly dissent in the meanes of obtayning *Grace*, & purchasing of *Heauen*; it must of necessity be inferred, that both the *Catholikes*, and *Protestants*, continuing in such their different states, cannot obtayne *Grace* and saluation; Since *Philosophy*, and naturall Reason

son teacheth vs. that he shall neuer attaine the End he aymeth at, who vseth not the same meanes, which are only and necessarily instituted to the gaying of the said End.

Now, to come to the Articles of this kynd. First Concerning the Sacraments in Generall; the *Catholikes* belieue, that all of them (where no iust impediment is) do conferre Grace vnto the Soule of man; by the helpe & continuance of which Grace, the soule in the end obtaineth its saluation. The *Protestant* doth not ascribe any such supernaturall effect vnto them.

To come more particularly to the Sacraments. Touching *Baptisme*, the *Catholikes* belieue, that Children being borne in Original Sinne, cannot be saued, except they be baptized with Water: The (25) *Protestants* belieue, that Infants dying vnbaptized may be saued.

(25) Calvin and Beza most frequently teach so.

Touching the Sacrament of Penance, or Confession; the *Catholikes* belieue, that after a Christian hath committed any Mortall Sinne, that Sinne cannot be forgiven him, but (at least in Voto) by confessing the said Sinne to a Priest, answerably to that in *S. Iohn 20. Whose sinnes you shall forgive, they are forgiven them &c.* The *Protestants* belieue, that neither the Confession of sinnes to man, nor the absolution of them giuen by man, is necessary for the remitting of them; but that it is sufficient to confesse them only to God. And thus according to the di-

uerſity

versity of Doctrine, either the Protestant for want of this *Sacrament* (after he hath mortally sinned) cannot be saued; or the Catholikes for wrongfully imposing this yoke vpon Christians, do lose their Saluation:

Touching the most B. *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*; The *Catholikes* belieue, that the very body and bloud of *Christ* do lye latently vnder the formes of bread and wyne; Math. 26. and that vnlesse we eate his body, and drinke his bloud in the *Eucharist*, we shall not haue lyfe euerlasting, Iohn. 6. Finally, that we are to adore *Christ* his body in the *Eucharist*, being accompanied there with his *Divinity*. The *Protestants* belieue, that *Christs* true body (as neuer leaving Heauen) cannot possibly be vnder the formes of bread and wyne; and consequently they belieue, that the reall eating of his body and drinking of his bloud in the *Sacrament*, is not necessary to Saluation: finally they hould our adoration of the *Sacrament* to be open Idolatry.

Fistly, touching the meanes of our *Iustification*; the *Catholikes* belieue, that not only *faith*, but *works* also do iustify. The *Protestants* do ascribe their Iustification only to *Fayth*, and not to *works*.

Touching *Grace* (without which a man cannot be saued) the *Catholikes* belieue, that God out of the depth of his infinite mercy, offereth to every Christian sufficient *Grace*, whereby he may be saued. The *Protestants*

teach, that God giueth not sufficient *Grace* to euery one, but to certaine men only; and according hereto, *Beza* most blasphemously

(16) *Beza* thus writeth of this point; (26) God decreeth in his Display some men to destruction, createth to perdition, and predestineth to his hatred & destruction, of Pope- Touching the ten Commandements, the ry. pag. *Catholikes* belieue, that except a Christian do 17. 31. 76. keepe them, he cannot be saued, according 116. &c. to our Saniour: *Yf thou wilt enter into lyfe, keep the Commandments.* Math. 19. The *Protestants* do teach an absolute impossibility of keeping them: and thereupon *Luther* thus

(17) *Luther* writeth: The ten (27) Commandements do not belong vnto vs.

de Moyse.

Finally touching the Pope, or Bishop of *Rome*, the *Catholikes* do belieue, that he is vnder *Christ*, the supreme Pastour vpon earth; that who do not communicate in Sacraments and Doctrines with him, yielding him all true obedience, in subiecting their iudgments in Matter of fayth to his sententionall Definitions, cannot be saued.

The *Protestants* do teach, that the Pope is that *Antichrist*, which is deciphered by the (28) *Apostle*; and that who so imbraceth his Doctrines, or yieldeth their assents to his Cathedrall Decrees, cannot be saued.

(18) 1. Theff. 2. &c.

Thus far of these points (omitting some others of like nature.) Now here I vrge, as aboue; *Yf* these former Doctrines (as they are belieued by the *Catholikes*) do immediately concerne *Saluation*, and become necessary

ecessary meanes thereof; then cannot the Protestants (as reiecting all such doctrines, and all such necessary meanes both in be- liefe and practice) be saued; But if by suppo- sal, the said Doctrines be not of that Na- ture, but false in themselves, and the contra- ry Doctrines true; then cannot the Catho- likes (as belieuing false Doctrines, imme- diately touching mans Saluation, and accor- dingly practizing them) be saued: From whence it ineuitably followeth, that the different Professours of these contrary do- ctrines (the one part belieuing, the other part not belieuing the said Doctrines) can- not both be saued.

Animaduerſion CLXXVII.

SOME Protestants will maintaine, that Pro- testancy (for its greater antiquity) was at its full, and perfect state here in England in King Edwards dayes. But this is most vnad- uisedly spoken; The falsehood of which bold Assertion, I proue from the Commu- nion Booke, set out in K. Edwards tyme, with approbation & allowance of Peter Martyr. Which Booke was further warranted in King Edwards tyme, by Act of Parliament. Now this Booke, or *publike Liturgy* of the fayth of England in those dayes, being printed in folio by Edward Whitchurch anno (29) Pol. 1549. prescribeth, *that the Eucharist shalbe* 163. *consecrated with the* (29) *signe of the Crosse.* It (30) Pol. commandeth *consecration* (30) *of the Water of* 123.

(31) Pol.

116.

(32) Pol.

117.

(33) Pol.

119.

(34) Ibi

dem.

(35) Pol.

141.

(36) Pol.

141.

(37) Pol.

141.

(18) M.

Doubt in

his per-

suasion

to En-

glish Re-

cusants.

pag. 31.

Baptisme, with the signe of the Crosse. In that Booke mention is made of Prayer (31) for the Dead; offering up of our prayers by (32) Angels. It defendeth Baptisme being given by Lay (33) Persons in tyme of Necessity; and the Grace (34) of that Sacrament. It alloweth Priests absolution of the sick penitent in these words: By the authority committed (35) unto me, I absolve thee of all thy sinnes. It mentioneth a speciall and particular (36) Confession of the Sicke Penitent. Briefly (to omit some other points.) It commandeth the (37) annoyning of the Sick person; which we Catholikes call the Sacrament of Extreme Vnction. But to proceede further in this point; touching the Booke of Common Prayer in thole dayes, I will alledge the words of M. Done (an eminent Protestant) who thus writeth hereof: Concerning (38) the Booke of Common prayer, when the Masse was first put downe, K. Henry had his English Liturgy, and that was indged absolute, and without exception. But when King Edward came to the Crowne, that was condemned, and another in the place was made, which Peter Martyr, and Bucer did approue, as very consonant to Gods word. When Queene Elizabeth began to reigne, the former was indged to be full of imperfections, and a new deuised, and allowed by consent of the Clergy. But about the middle of her reigne we grew weary of that Booke and great meanes hath beene made to abandon that, and establish another. Which though it was not obtrayned, yet do we at the least at euery chan-

ge of Prince, change our Booke of Common prayer: We be so wanton, that we know not, what we would haue. Thus this Protestat. Now from hence I conclude; First, that *Protestancy* here in England is not so ancient, as from king Edwards dayes; Secondly, that it was not at perfection in the middle of *Queen Elizabeths* reigne; For if it had then beene perfect and complete, there had beene no neede of a new Common Prayer-Booke; For at euery change of the Common booke of prayer, there was a change of points of sayth, according to which points the former *Communion Booke* was to be reformed & corrected. And therefore according to the iudgment of men of those tymes it is thus said by M. Parker. The day-starre (39) was not risen so high in their days, when yet *Queene Elizabeth* reformed the defects of King Edwards Communion Booke &c. Symbo- Iet so altered (40) as that when it was pro- lizing- posed to be confirmed by the Parliament, it was part. 2. refused.

(39) M.
Parker
against
Symbo-
lizing.
part. 2.
cap. 30

Animaduerſion CLXXVIII.

P. 3. 4.
(40) Ibid.

The Doctrine of *Resuscancy* is taught both by Protestants and Catholikes; Since both of them hold it a most wicked thing, and not to be donne, but vnder payne of damnation without finall repentance; that a man should communicate only in going to the Church, and to heare but a sermon, contrary to that Religion, which himselfe be- leueth to be true. For though this A& may

dem. pag. 37.

seeme to be couered vnder pretence of ob-
 serving the Princes commandement, & for
 feare of losing our temporall estates; yet in
 very deed this Act of going to the Church
 virtually and potentially includeth a con-
 formity in all points to the religion of that
 Church to the which a Man goeth; and so it
 comes to be a dissimulation; or rather an
 absolute Abnegation of that Religion,
 which a man holds in his soule to be the
 only true Religion.

Now, that the Protestants do teach the
 Doctrine of *Recusancy* (I meane, not to be
 present at the sermons, or Prayers of a dif-
 ferent Religion) I proue from (41) *Calwin*,
 from the *Deuines* (42) of *Germany*, from
Melancthon (43), from *Peter* (44) *Martyr*,
 and (to omit others) from D. (45) *Willet*.

(41) *Cal-*
uin de vi-
sandis
supersti-
tionibus.
extas in
tract.
Theolog.
pag. 184.
(42) The
Deuines
of Ger-
many, al-
ledged in
this
point by
Sleyden

That the Catholikes do with the like, or
 greater seruour, preach and practice the
 same Doctrine of *Recusancy*; is cleare by the
 Example in our owne Country, where since
 Protestancy was first planted, some scores
 (besides of the Laity) of Venerable & lea-
 ned priests, haue chosen rather to suffer
 death in *Queene Elizabeth* her Reigne, then
 once to goe to the Protestant Church; their
 liues being commonly proffered them, if
 they would conformance themselves, and leave
 their

in *Comment. Englished* l. 7 fol. 87. (41) *Melancthon* in *Concil.*
Theolog. de. 618. (44) *Peter Martyr* in his discourse hereof re-
 sed in *Melancthon* *Treatise de Concil. Theolog.* p. 394. (45) *Willet*
 in *Synops.* printed 1600. pag. 611. 613, &c.

their *Refusancy*. But they loathed such Conditions.

For the more full prooffe of this Verity, I add the Testimonies of three most eminent & most remarkable Men; whose iudgements some yeares past being demanded, whether the Catholikes of England might for saving their goods & livings, go to the Protestant Church to heare a Sermon, did ioyntly condemne the same, as most vnlawfull and impious. The men were these, *Cardinall Bellarmine*, *Cardinall Baronius*, and *Martin Vitellescus*, now generall of the Order of the Society of Iesus. I will heere set downe their owne words.

The Judgment of Cardinall Bellarmine.

Consideratis rationibus pro utraque parte allatis, existimo non licere viris Catholicis in Anglia Hæreticorum adire Ecclesias; multo minus concionibus ipsorum interesse; minime autem omnium cum ipsis in precibus, vel Psalmodia, alijq; ipsorum Ecclesiasticis ritibus conuenire. Ideo propria manu subscripsi,

*Robertus Bellarminus Sanctæ R. Ecclesiæ
Presbyter, Cardinalis tituli Sanctæ
Mariæ in via.*

The iudgment of Cardinall Baronius.

Vlta & consideratis, quæ superius diligentè peruestigatione in utramque partem disputata,

data, reiectis omnino & exafflatis, quæ pro parte affirmatiua fuerit proposita, quod scilicet liceret Catholicis adire Ecclesias Hæreticorum, ut superioribus sunt proposita, in heremus saniori sententia posteriori, ab Ecclesia Catholica antiquitas recepta, & usu probata; quod scilicet ita facere non liceat: quam rogo nostros Catholicos Angliam amplecti ex animo.

Cæsar Cardinalis Baronius tituli. SS. Nerei & Achillei Presb.

The indgmet of Mutinus Vitellescus, then Provinciall, now Generall of the Order of the Jesuits.

V*Idi rationes, quæ in hoc Scripto pro utraque parte afferuntur, & existimo non licere Catholicis in Anglia, Ecclesias Hæreticorum adire &c. Et pnto hoc debere esse extra Controversiam.*

Mutinus Vitellescus Provincialis Romanæ Promin. Societatis Iesu.

Thus much in generall touching the Doctrine of *Recusancy*, mantayned by diuine learned Protestants; and practised with loss of life by many Reuerend Priests here in England; and fortified with the iudgments of these three former most learned, pious, and godly Men.

Animaduerſion CLXXIX.

He moſt common abuſe in England, of taking a ſecond wyfe, during the lyfe of the firſt, committing fornication, induceth me to expound thoſe words of our Saniour, from whence the offenders herein ſeeme to warrant their ſenſuall proceedings: for thus our Saniour in *Matthew 19.* ſpeaketh: *Whoſoever ſhall put away his wyfe, except it be for fornication, and ſhall marry another, doth commit adultery;* from which words our Aduerſaries ſeeme to infer, that who doth put away his wyfe for fornication, and marrieth another, doth not commit Adultery. But this is thus answered; To wit, that this exception of Fornication is only to ſhew, that for this cauſe a man may put away his wyfe for ever, but not that he may marry another, as moſt playne in *5. Mark c. 10.* and *5. Luke 16.* both who leaue out this expoſition, ſaying thus abſolutely: *Whoſoever putteth away his wyfe, and marrieth another, committeth adultery.* And this expoſition is giuen by *S. Thomas Sent. in 4. diſtinct. 35. quaſt. unica c. 5.* So as in theſe former words of *Math. 19.* a Parentheſis is to be vnderſtood, after this manner: *Whoſoever putteth away his wyfe, which is not lawfull, except it be for fornication, & marrieth another, committeth adultery.* Now that the expoſition of our Aduerſaries of the ſaid text was cōdemned throughout all ages of the primitiue Church, is moſt cleere,

cleere, since the Fathers of each such age, are
 taught, that a man putting away his wife
 upon any occasion, yea for *Fornication*, could
 not marry any other Woman. For example
 thus in the first Age *Clement* teacheth,
Canon. Apostol. can. 48. In the second
 Age *Iustinus Martyr*, in *Apolog. pro Christianis*.
In the third, Tertullian l. 4. in Marcionem.
In the fourth Age, the Conncell of Elie
ris can. 9. In the fifth, *Concil. Milevitanum*
can. 17. and *S. Austin lib. de adulterinis con-*
gijs. In the sixth age, *Primasius in Comment.*
cap. 7. prioris ad Corinth. Now here I vrg
 that if the former exposition of the Catholikes
 likes be false, then did the *Primitive Church*
 wholly erre therein, which is most absurd
 maintayne. In like manner, the *Primitive*
Church of Christ did then wrong many
 Christians in not suffering them to vie
 upon occasion of the wyues *Fornication*, the
 priuiledg, which *Christ* may seeme to gra
 to them. I may add hereto, that diuers lea
 ned Protestants, by maintayning, that in
 case of Diuorce vpon *adultery* the innocent
 party cannot marry againe, do reiect
Aduersaries exposition of the former text
 of *Matthew 19.* According hereto (to
 mit many other moderate Protestants te
 ching the same with vs Catholikes) *D. H. diane*
son in his *tertia Thesi* printed 1602. maint
 neth the same, publikely in *Oxford.* In
 fort somethirty yeares since (more or les
 the same Doctrine was preached at *Pa* and first

by D. Dones. Now, to all this aboue
 said, I may adioyne the exposition of S. Au-
 gustine in l. i. de adulterinis coniugijs, cap. 9. of the
 foresaid text, who there sayth, That the
 words in Math. 19. v2. (*nisi ob fornicationem*)
 ought to be taken negative, non exceptiue, by
 way of negation, not of exception; So as the
 sense of them may be this: *Whofoener shall*
put away his wyfe, nisi ob fornicationem, that is,
extra causam fornicationis, without the cause of
 fornication, and shall marry another, commit-
 teth adultery. From which exposition the A-
 dultery of him is affirmed, who putting a-
 way his wyfe, without the cause of fornication,
 shall marry another: But nothing is
 here said of him, who putting away his wyfe
 by reason of fornication, shall marry ano-
 ther. Thus far of this Text.

Animaduersion C L X X X.

As the Inuisibility and Latency of the Pro-
 testants Church hath beene fully aboue
 demonstrated; so here I hould it not imper-
 tinent, if I proue the Continuall and vnin-
 terrupted visibility of our Catholike Church;
 and consequently that it is that Church of
 God, to which so many Propheyses haue
 bene made of its vneclipsed splendour and
 radiancy: Thy (46) Gates shalbe conti-
 nually open; neither day nor night shall they be
 shut &c. (46) E/46
 60.

Now this verity is proued seuerall wayes.
 And first from the confessed Inuisibility of
 the

the Protestant Church during all former ages, till *Luthers* insurrection. And this rather, seeing the learned Protestants confesse, that all the former *Inuisibility* of the Protestant Church was wrought by the labour, power, and diligence of the Catholike Roman Church. Now how could the Roman Church effect so much, for so long a tyme, except it selfe during all that tyme were *most visible*? According to this assertion, we find *M. Napper* to confesse the same reason of his Churches *Inuisibility*, in these words: During (47) *euen the second & third*

(47) *Napper*
upon the
Revela-
tions,
cap. 12.
& 13.

age (meaning since Christ) the true Church of God, and the light of the Gospel, was obscured by the Roman Antichrist himselfe. Secondly, the euer *Visibility* of the Catholike Church is proued from the acknowledged succession of *Pastours* in our Catholike Church euer since the Apostles: since those visible *Pastours* were the visible and most eminent members of our said Church, preaching and instructing others, who in this respect must become also visible and knowne. Now this our visible succession

(48) *D.*
Fulke in
his ans
wer to a
Counter
joyte Ca-
tholike.
p. 27.

of *Pastours* in our Roman Church is confessed euen by our Aduersaries; for thus *D. Fulke* exprobrateth the Catholiks in these words: Thou (48) can name (chiefe) *Personages* in all ages (marke these words, in all ages) and their gouernment, and ministry, and especially the succession of the Popes you haue upon your fingers. Thus *D. Fulke*;

Thirdly,

Thirdly, and lastly the same is thus proved: Yf the most ancient and reuerend Fathers of the primitiue Church; I meane, Ignatius, Dionysius Arcopagita, Iustinus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, Hilarius, the Cyrills, the Gregories, Ambrose, Basill, Opratus, Gaudentius, Chrysostome, Ierome, Austin, and diuers others, be accounted by our Aduersaries most earnest Professours of our Catholike Roman sayth; then it followeth most consequently, that our Catholike Church was most conspicuous in those tymes; since those Fathers were the visible Pastours of the Church then in Being. Now that the Fathers of those primitiue tymes were Papists, professing the present Roman sayth, appeareth (besides from what is already most fully confessed by our Aduersaries in that behalfe) euen from that acknowledgment of Peter Martyr, saying: As long (49) as we (49) Persist in the fathers so long we shalbe conuersant ter Mar-
in the Papists errors. tyr Lib

Now that our Catholike Church hath beene further also most visible, since the 470.
tymes of those primitiue Fathers (I meane for these last thousand yeares) is so fully confessed by our Aduersaries in this Treatise, as that I should it ouer wearisome and fastidious, so often to repeate such their Confessions.

Animaduerſion CLXXXI.

THE mayne Argument drawne from Reason, which our Aduersaryes vrge against *unwritten Traditions*, is this; It seemeth (say they) impossible that *unwritten Traditions* can be kept and conserued: since there are diuers hinderances thereof; as *Forgetfulness*, *Ignorance*, *negligence*, *peruersnes of mens Natures*, and the like. And hence it is, that we see, that such Sentences, which *Lycurgus*, *Pythagoras*, and others, deliuered only in words, and not in wryting, are at this day lost, and perished.

To this I answere, that I hould it impossible, that *Apostolicall Traditions* should not be preserued; since this care is not properly incumbent vpon *Man* but vpon *God*, who gouerneth the Church. Now besydes the prouidence of *God*, which is the chiefe cause of preseruing the *Traditions* of the Church, there are foure other inferiour, or subordinate Causes, for their preseruatiō.

The first, is the committing of *Traditions* to wryting; For although they be not set downe in *Holy writ* (I meane, in the *diuine Scriptures*) yet they are recorded and written in the Monuments of the auncient Authors, and in Ecclesiasticall bookes.

The second reason may be the *continuall vse of them*; For diuers *Traditions* are in continuall obseruation & practise, as the Rites and Ceremonies of administering the Sacraments

ments, Holy-dayes, appoynted tymes of fasting, the Celebration of the Masse, and of Diuine office, or prayers, and such like.

The third cause, are certaine *externall Monuments*, which continue for a most long tyme; as most ancient Tēples or Churches, in which are Altars, the Holy Fonts for Baptisme, the Memorials, or Tournes of Saints, Crosses, Images, Ecclesiasticall bookes &c.

The fourth Reason, is *Heresy* it selfe; For God doth wonderfully vte the Enemyes of the Church, to the preservation of the Church. For because, as in euery age there haue risen vp some Heretyks, who haue impugned diuers dogmaticall *Traditions* of the Church; So hath God in ech age rayfed certaine learned & Orthodoxall Men, who, that they might better resist the Heretykes, haue with most great diligence and labour searched out the Doctrine of the Church, and ancient *Traditions*, and haue transmitted them in wryting to all posterity. I will ad this following obseruation, in fuller warrant of *unwritten Traditions* against such, who restrayne the prooffe of all poynts to the Scripture it selfe; To wit, that it is one thing, for an Article of fayth to be expressed in Scripture; Another thing, for an Article of fayth to be grounded upon Scripture. All Christian doctrine is not expressed in Scripture; yet euery Christian doctrine is so grounded on Scripture, that it may in some sort, or
X 2 other,

other, be proued from Scripture; And in this sense all *Traditions* receaued by the vniuersall Church of Christ, may be said to be grounded on Scripture, since they are grounded vpon the authority of the Church, admitting them; To which Church, *Christ* himselfe hath promised an infallibility of Truth, and of not erring; according to that, *Ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque Consummationem seculi. Math. 18.* And againe: *Porte inferi non preualebunt aduersum eam. Math. 16.* to wit, against the Church of Christ.

Animaduerſion CLXXXII.

PROtestancy is proued to be an intentionall thing in it selfe, and voyde of all *Real* sayth. This is proued from the Definition of *Fayth*, giuen by the Apostle, thus defining sayth: *fides est sperandarum substantiarum rerum, argumentum non apparentium*; That is, (so) *Heb. sayth is the (50) substance of things, to be hoped for; the argument of things, not appearing.* This definition sheweth, that sayth is a supernaturall Vertue, and the *Object* thereof is that, which through its owne abstrusenes & sublimity cannot be apprehended or concealed by force of Mans owne wit, it transcending all Naturall Reason. This we see exemplytyed in the two supreme Articles of the *Trinity*, and the *Incarnation*; the Mysteries and difficulties of which transcend all humane reason, or light of Nature. And hence

hence it is , that the Conclusion of the Schoole Deuines is this : *Quæ (51) fidei sunt, (51)S. non possunt esse scita.* Now to apply this: Yf *Thomas. part. 2. 2. quæst. 1.* Protestancy be a supernaturall fayth (or els it is no true sauing fayth) then the *Obiect* of this Protestantickall fayth is of that difficult Nature , as that Man through the force of Naturall reason only, cannot giue any assent thereto, without the speciallconcurrency of *Gods Grace.*

But here I demand, that seeing the *Obiect* of Protestancy (as *Protestancy*) is meere *Negatives*, and *denialls* (as *deniall of Reall Presence, deniall of Purgatory, deniall of Freewill, deniall of praying to Saints, briefly deniall of most of the affirmative points taught by our Catholike Church:*) here I say , I demand, what *supernaturality*, or force of Gods speciall concurrency is required, that man should giue an assent to these *Negations*, or *denyalls*: Nay I here say, that mans naturall reason euen of it selfe (without any external help) is propense and inclyning to belieue these , and other such like *Negations*, except the *Affirmatiues* to those *Negations*, can be conuincd as for true , either by *Diuine* or *Humane* prooffe , and *Authority*. Thus it followeth , that *Protestancy* euen from the Definition of *Fayth*, giuen by the *Apostle*, is no *supernaturall Fayth*, but in respect of such a *Fayth*, is a meere *Irreality*, and wast of fayth.

Animaduerſion CLXXXIII.

(51) S.
Thom in
3. part.
quaest.
27. Ar-
tic. 4.

THE reasons, which S. Thomas Aquinas (52) doth insist vpon (being most probable inducements) for freeing the Blessed Virgin Mary from Originall Sinne, are these following.

The first: Seeing God did decree to aduance the Blessed Virgin to so supreme dignity, that she should excellen the Angells themselves; therefore it was most suitable & agreeable, that no priuiledg should be conferred vpon any pure Creature, which was not conferred vpon the B. Virgin, (except such a priuiledg were repugnant to the condition, state, Nature, or Sex;) But to be sanctified in the first instant of Creation, was giuen to our First Parents; As also to be sanctified in the first instant of Creation, and neuer to be polluted with any Sinne, was giuen to the holy Angells: But this priuiledg is in no sort repugnant to the condition, state, Nature, or Sex of the B. Virgin: Therefore it is a pious thing to belieue, that the Mother of God did not want this priuiledge.

(51) Can.
4.

Secondly, because that testimony of the Heavenly Spouse ought in all probability to be accomplished and fulfilled in the Blessed Virgin: *Tota (53) pulchra es amica mea, & macula non est in te.*

Thirdly, because the Mother of Christ hath a singular Affinity, and Coniunction with

with *Christ* himselfe.

Fourthly, in that the Sonne of God (who is the *wisdom* of the Father) did (as it were) inhabitate in the wombe of the Mother, after a most peculiar and wonderfull manner:

But it is said in holy Scripture: *In malenolam* (54) *animam* &c. *Wisdom* cannot enter into a wicked hart, nor dwell in the body, which is subiect to *sinne*. (14) Wis-
doms.c.x.
(55) S.
Ieroma
writeth a
sermon,
styling it,
de Beſto
assump-
tionis
Mariæ.
The Cen-
turists
alledge
that S.
Austin,
did write
a Booke
entitu-
ling it, de
Assump-
tione
Virginis
Mariæ.

Lastly, because as well the honour as the ignominy of the Mother redoundeth to the Sonne. Now touching the prooffe of the *Assumption* of our B. Lady both in Body & Soule (pretermittting the Authority of the (55) Ancient Fathers herin) I will at this present, content my selfe with the Argument of S. Bernard in prooffe thereof, who thus disputeth: Seeing God hath discovered and reuealed the Bodies of many Saints (which lay hid in diuers places) that they might be honored of faythful Christians; It then ineuitably followeth, that if the sacred Body of the Blessed Virgin had beene still on earth, he would in like manner haue made knowne (no doubt) in what place or Country it did lye. But it not being certainly knowne, where that Body, or any part thereof is in any place of the world; it may irreplicably be concluded, that her Body is not to be found in Earth, but only in *Heauen*; & this is S. Bernards demonstration in this point.

Animaduerſion CLXXXIV.

(a) *Berz* **B** *erz* (as aboue is shewed) thus writeth of
 in his the Doctrine of reprobation: God (a) de-
 Display creeth to destruction, createth to perdition, and
 etc. predestinateth to his hatred, and Destruction,
 pag. 17. with whom accordeth Calvin (as elsewhere
 31. 78. is shewed) in these words: (b) God by his
 etc. Concell and appointment, doth so ordaine, that
 (b) *Calu* amongst men, some be borne destined to certain
Iustis. l. 1. death from their Mothers Wombe, who by their
 cap. 13. perdition may glorify his Name. Now heere
 paragr. 6. with the diligent Reader to obserue the
 dangerous resistaneyes, and Absurdities
 necessary following from this their do-
 ctrine of Reprobation. First: it is a mayne hin-
 derance to *Virtue*, and encouragement to
Vice, (as aboue I haue declared:) Since it
 teacheth, that that man, who is reprobated,
 cannot preuent his reprobation by any pious
 lyfe, how vertuous soeuer, why then should
 that man abstaine from exercise of wicked-
 nes, seeing his wickednes doth not in any
 sort further his damnation; it being (by
 the Protestants Doctrine) decreed from all
 Eternity, without respect of any works
 good, or bad?

(c) *Ete-* Secondly, this Doctrine maketh God,
 ch. 14. Lyar, and dissembler. For to omit infinit
 (d) 1. other texts of Scripture, we find his Pro-
Peter 3. phets thus to speake of God: God (c) will
 (e) 2. *Ti.* the death of the wicked. And again: He (d) will
moth. 1. not haue any to perish. And yet more: God (e)

ould haue all men saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. Now I say, if God createth some men absolutely from their Mothers wombe, without respect of his Sinnes, to eternall damnation; are not these his fayre speeches to be interpreted but *Distimulation*, and *untruths*? and followeth it not then consequently, that this their blasphemous doctrine labours to transforme God into the *Demill*, by making him to utter lyes and speake false; for of the *Demill* we thus read: *It is (f) he, who speaks Lyes of himself, &* (f) 1. *is a lyer, the Father of Lyes.* Ioan. 1.

Animaduerſion CLXXXV.

Y F we take into our consideration that other Doctrine of our Aduersaries, which teacheth, that *God is the Authour of sinne*; (which Doctrine we haue aboue shewed, to be mantayned by the Protestants) the inferences vnauoydably proceeding from that Doctrine are no lesse blasphemous, then the former. For first, it maketh God to be the only sinner, and that the *Demill* and *Man* are innocent, and no sinners at all. For if the thiefe (for example) be compelled by God to steale, who compells the Deuill to set on the thiefe (as *Swinglins* (g) affirmes) (g) *Swinglins* gl. Serm. de prouid. then is not God in this case the only Sinner? This is proued, since the goodnes & badnes of the worke in euery Action, is chiefly to be attributed to the *Principall Authour*, willer, and worker of it, and not to the *Instru-*

ment: And this the rather, since *Austin* sayth: *Sinne is so voluntary, that except it be voluntary, it is no sinne.* But *sinne* is only voluntary in *God* (according to the doctrine of our Aduersaries) and not in *Man*, in whom it is necessary. Therefore hence I conclude, that according to this their blasphemy, *Sinne* is only in *God*, and not in *Man*. Secondly, this Doctrine, of *God* being the *Author* of *Sinne*, ascribeth the proprieties of the *Devill*

(h) *Mat.* 4. to *God*. For it is the office of the *Devill* to tempt man, and therefore in the Holy (h) writ, the *Devill* is called a *Tempter*. But this is more peculiar to *God* (according to the foresaid Doctrine) then to the *Devill*; Since *God* (in the iudgment of the Protestants) so forcibly tempteth man to sinne, as that it is not in his power to resist, or withstand the temptation; which is more, then the *Devill* can performe.

Thirdly, it is the property of the *Devill* to sow *Tares*, or ill weedes of sinne, in the Fyeld of our *Harts*; according to those words: *The Enemy (i) comes, and sowes tares.* But *God* doth this according to the former Doctrine, more then the *Devill*: For *God* (as *Calvin* affirms) doth execrate (k) and obdurate the minds of men, doth strike them with a spirit of error, giddines, and madnes, and this not by permission, but by operation. Thus *Calvin*.

(i) *Mat.*

13.

(k) *Cal.*

uin. 1. *In.*

Ris. 13.

or 14. *or*

4. *Instit.*

14.

Animaduerſion CLXXXVI.

THE Protestants Doctrine of the infallibility of only *fayth* iustifying a Man, and of some other of their positions, takes away the force of *all Prayer*, making it either *needles*, or *fruitlesse*: *Needles*, as of things certaine, which need not to be asked; *Fruitles*, as of things impossible, which cannot be obtained. The first point is thus proued: That *Prayer* is *needles*, which prays for that which cannot sayle vs, as either already past, or assuredly posselt, or to come; Therefore according to the Protestants grounds, they ought not to pray for Remission of Sinnes, for the fauour of God, for perseuerance in *fayth*, or for the glory of Heauen, since every Protestant by his speciall *fayth* belieueth (in his iudgment) most certainly, that his Sinnes are forgiven him, and that he shall perseuer in *fayth*, and come to Heauen. The second point (to wit, of the *Fruitlesnes of Prayer*) is in like wise thus euicted: To pray for the keeping of the *Ten Commandements*, is fruitles, since our Aduersaries teach (as I haue aboue shewed) that the keeping of them is impossible. In like manner, it is *Fruitles*, to pray for the *Preventing* of any Euill, whether it be *Malum culpa*, as sinne, or *Malum pena*, as punishment; or whether it be any temporall affliction whatsoeuer. And the reason is, because (as our Aduersaries do teach,) All *Euill* as well,

well as *Good*, shall infallibly fall out, as God hath, according to his owne irrespēctiue immutable, and ineuitable will & pleasure decreed and appointed it. For sorting here to (to omit the like authorities of many others in this point) *Luther* thus writeth of a *Fatall Necessity* of things: *Nullius* (1) est in manu &c. It is in no mans power to thinke *Good* or *Euill*, but all things proceed from absolute *Necessity*. Thus we see, that it ineuitably & most consequently may be gathered from the Protestants *Theorems* and principles, that all *Prayer* is either *Needles*, or *Fruitles*, & inuayleable.

(1) *Luther* in
Assert.
damnat.
per Leo-
nem.
A 19. 36.

Animaduerſion CLXXXVII.

MAny of the learned Protestants, weighing the emptines of their owne Religion, as consisting only of *Tenets*, which are but an Annihilation of all positive and true fayth, haue therefore vpon mature deliberation in diuers weighty points wholly reiected the *Negative Religion* of our Adversaries; and in place thereof haue fully embraced the contrary *Affirmative*, & Catholike Articles of fayth, euer, and at this day maintayned by the *Church of Rome*; So true

(m) Con- is that saying of *S. Austin*: *Truth* (m) is more
tra Do. forcible to wring out Confession, then any racke
nat. post. torment. For the proote of this verity I refer
col. r. 14. the studious Reader to the Booke of the
Protestants Apology; where beginning at the
Page 684. & sequensib. at the letter *M*. in the
margin,

margent, he shall find fyfty at least of our
Affirmative, and Catholike Doctrines de-
 fended, and maintayned by the most lear-
 ned Protestants, that euer did write. I will
 here only reckon the titles of diuers of the
 said Articles, so belieued and taught by the
 Protestants. viz. 1. *Real presence*. 2. *That Sa-*
craments do confer grace. 3. *The sufficiency of*
Christs corporall Death. 4. *That Christ descen-*
ded in soule, into Limbs Patrum. 5. *The conti-*
nual Visibilty of the Church. 6. *The Necessity of*
Good works to Salvation. 7. *Euangelicall Coun-*
sells. 8. *The Doctrine of vniuersality of Grace*.
 9. *That God doth only permit sinne, but decreeth*
it not. 10. *That men are not certaine of their E-*
lection. 11. *That to Children of the saythfull, dying*
unbaptized, saluation is not promised. 12. *Free-*
will. 13. *That in regard of Christs Passion and*
promise, our Good Works are meritorious. 14.
Temporall punishment reserved by God in Iustice,
after the sinne is remitted. 15. *Peters Primacy*.
 16. *Intercession of Angells*. 17. *Intercession of*
Saincts. 18. *Inuocation of Saincts*. 19. *Vowed*
Chastity. 20. *Voluntary Concrety, Chastity, and*
Obedience. 21. *Prayer for the Dead*. 22. *Purgato-*
ry. 23. *Limbs Patrum*. 24. *Images in Churches*.
 25. *Worshipping of Images*. 26. *Reuerence, and*
bowing at the name of Iesus. 27. *That the good*
Works of one may help another. 28. *Power of a*
priest to remit sinnes. 29. *Confession of sinnes*.
 30. *Distinction of mortall, and veniall sinne*.
 31. *The indifferency of Communion vnder one*
kind. 32. *Sacrifice of the New Testament, accor-*
 ding

ding to the Order of Melchisedech 33. The possibility of the Commandements. 34. Transubstantiation. 35. That Christ is God of God. 36. That Christ (as Man) was from his Nativity free from Ignorance, and was full of knowledge. 37. Baptisme of Women, and Lay persons in tyme of Necessity. 38. Seauen Sacraments. 39. Implicit fayth, called Fides implicita. 40. That Antichrist is yet to come. 41. Patronage and protection of certaine Angells, ouer certaine Countreyes and Kingdomes. 42. That the Obseruation of Sunday for our Sabaoth, is not alterable. 43. That the alteration of the Sabaoth from Saturday to Sunday not proued by Scripture. 44. Set tymes of fasting. 45. The true visible Church cannot erre. 46. externall indgment (and not only Scripture) appointed for determining of Controversies. 47. That the gouernment of the Church is Monarchicall. 48. Which is true Scripture, determined to vs only by the Church. 49. That the Church of Rome is a part of the house of God. 50. Unwritten Traditions, besides some other Catholike points taught by the learned Protestants. Here now I demand, that if the Protestants Profelyts, and followers do belieue their Grand-masters in diuers points of their owne Religion, why then should not they belieue the learned Protestants, maintayning our Catholike doctrines; since (abstracting from the authority of the Church) both the said seuerall sorts of Protestants do maintayne their contrary Tenets, euen withequall and indifferent privileged of their owne Primate Spirit? *Ans.*

Animaduersion CLXXXVIII.

AS aboue I compared *Luther*, being *Catholike* (touching manners and Conuer-
 sation of Lyfe) with *Luther* being *Protestant*,
 So heere I will make another comparatiue
 betweene the Liues of *Catholikes* and of
Protestants. And here it is to be obserued;
 that I will not compare the most pious men
 in former tymes, with the best of the *Pro-*
testants; nor the worst men for life of the
 one Religion, with the worst of the other;
 but (for the greater confronting of our Ad-
 uersaries, and aduantage to our *Catholike*
 Cause) I will compare the declining state of
Catholike tymes, with the best tymes of
Protestancy, which is presumed to be at the
 first entrance and beginning of *Protestan-*
cy, when the first *Protestants* enioyed the
Primities, and first fruites of their Religion. (n) *Lut-*
 This point will be made euident euen from *th. in po-*
 the confessions of the *Protestants* themself. *Still, su-*
ues. First then, we fynd *Luther* himself thus *per B-*
 to write: From (n) the tyme, in which the pure uangel.
 Doctrine of the Gospell was first revealed to Domini-
 light, the world hath growne dayly worse: Men *ca ori-*
 are more reuengefull, cometous, licentious, then *ma* Ad-
 they were euer before in the Papacy. With *uantus.*
 whom *Musculus* agreeth, thus complayning (o) *Mus-*
 hereof; *Vt verum* (o) *eff: fater* &c. To confesse *culus in*
 the truth, men are become so vniike themselves, *loc. com.*
 that whereas in the Papacy, they were religious *in cap, de*
 in their Errors and Superstition, now in the *Decalog.*
 lights *pag. 62.*

light of the knowne truth, they are more prophane
then the very Sonner of the world. I will
conclude with the testimony of Erasmus

(p) Eras- thus discoursing of this point: Quos (p) an-
mus Ep- tea non cram &c. Such men as I knew, to be be-
adfratres fore upright, candid, modest, and sincere in the
inferio- Connerfation, after, they had embraced the
vis Ger- new Sect (meaning of the Gospell) they in-
manie. stantly begun to talke of young Women, to play
dice, to leave off prayer, to be most impatient, &
remengfull of Injuries, and to conclude to aban-
don all humanity: expertus loquor. Thus far
resums. And thus much of the balancing
men of these two severall Religions. Now
I heere refer to an indifferent Iudgment
whether it be not a great blemish to Pro-
stancy, that it is confessed by the Pro-
stants, that the Professours thereof euen
their best tymes, were far worse, and more
wicked in manners, then the Catholikes
their worst, and most declyning tymes.

Animaduerfion CLXXXIX.

THe Protestants much solace themselves
in alledging certaine Texts of Scripture
in prooffe of Iustification by sayth only, which
passages being truly weighed, are found
to be most weakely, or rather impertinently
alledged, as in Math. 9. Thy sayth hath saved
thee. Iohn 3. Who belieueth in the Sonne, ha-
th eternall Lyfe. Finally (to omit some other
such seeming Texts) Rom. 5. We being ius-
fied by sayth, let vs haue peace towards God. &c.

these and such like I answer, and deny that it followeth; That *Fayth* only iustifyeth; though only *Fayth* be named. For sometymes also other *Vertues* are only named, or the *Sacraments*. For example, Luc. 7. we read: *Many sinnes are forgiven her, because she loved much.* Iob. 12. *Almesdeeds* freeth from death. Rom. 8. *By hope we are saved.* Finally, Titus 3. *He hath saved us by the Lawes of regeneration,* beides many other such passages: And yet no man will gather from theie authorities that *Charity*, or *Almesdeeds*, or *Hope*, or *Baptisme* do iustify without *Fayth*. Therefore when many different causes concur to produce one Effect, the Scripture attributeth the same Effect sometymes to one Cause, sometymes to another, and yet the Scripture doth not intend thereby to signify, that one cause is sufficient, without the other causes. Now the reason, why the Apostle more frequently attributes *Iustification* to *fayth*, then to other works, is deliuered by the Council (q) of Trent: To wit, be- (q) 8. d. cause, *Fides est initium gratuite Iustificationis*; & c. 8. *Fayth* is the beginning of a gratis, and free *Iustification*.

Animaduerſion CLXXX.

That so much prostituted passage of Scripture by our Aduersaries in prooffe of absolute *Reprobation* of some men, euen from their Mothers wombe, without any reference, or preuision of their works, in a

Y

clear

(r) Rom.
9,

clear iudgmēt proueth nothing, for which it vs vrged. The place is this: *Jacob (r) dilexi Esau autem odio habui*. Now, to this place I thus answere. First, this sentence is not to be vnderstood of those particuler persons *Jacob*, and *Esau*, but of the two people, to wit the *Israelites*, & the *Idumeans*. And what here is spoken of *Loue* and *Hate*, is not to be vnderstood of *Eternall Election*, or *Reprobation*, but of the good and bad tymes of this *Lyfe*. This is thus proued. For when in *Malachy* 1. God said these words: *I loued Jacob, and hated Esau*, he explayneth himselfe, how

(s) Ma.
lach, 1.

he doth loue, and hate; saying: *I haue (s) made his Mountaines (to wit Esau) wast, and his heritage a wilderness for Dragons*. Therefore God loued *Jacob*; because he gaue to him a Country flowing with milke and hony; and he hated *Esau*, because God gaue to him a sterill and desart Country. The same point

(t) Gen.
nes, 25.

is further also thus proued: When (t) *Rebecca* did demaund of God, why the two Children (to wit *Jacob* and *Esau*) which she bare in her wombe, did striue together; she was thus answered: *two Nations are in thy wombe, and two sorts of people shall be deuised out of thy bowells, and the one people shall be mightier then the other, and the Elder shall serue the younger*. Secondly admit, that those words *Esau autem odio habui*, were to be vnderstood particularly of *Esau*; yet they cannot be vnderstood of the person of *Esau*, without all preuision of his works; For *Esau*, as beinge

man, was (as all other things are) the handi-
 worke of God; and we read the Wiseman to
 say of God, *) *Nihil odisti eorum, quæ fecisti;* (*) *Sa-*
thou hatest nothing of those things which thou piest. 22.
hath made. Therefore what God hated in *Esa-*
was only the Sinne of Esau, and not his Per-
son. Thirdly, and lastly I answer, that ad-
 mit the former words were to be under-
 stood of the person of *Esa*, yet it follow-
 eth not, that any *Positive hatred* should be
 meant thereby, but only a lesse Loue to
Esau, then to *Jacob*. Euen as we read: *Si quis*
(u. venit ad me, & non ouit patrem suum &c.
Esau) man come to me, and hateth not his Fa- (u) *Lue;*
ther, and Mother, and Wyfe, and Children &c. 14.
gea and his owne life besides, he cannot be my
Disciple; In which words there is not com-
 manded any *Positive hatred* of Father, Mo-
 ther, Wyfe &c. but is commanded only a
 lesse degree of loue towards these things
 then towards God. Thus far in explication
 of this former, so often aliedged, Text.

Animaduersion C L X X X I.

IT is the custome of many of our Aduer-
 saries euen Scholers, when they see them-
 selues defectiue, either in answering our
 Catholike Arguments, vrged against Pro-
 testaney, or impugning of our Catholike
 sayth, do make their last Refuge to the
Cloath of State (as I may say) shadowing
 themselves and their Cause vnder it: my
 Y 2 meaning

meaning is this, That they seek to charge our Religion with teaching disobedience & disloyalty against our natural Princes.

Now, to vindicate our selues from this false imputation, I will insist in the doctrine taught of this point (by our Aduerſaries) far more dangerous, then any Doctrine of this point, maintayned by any learned Catholikes. For example. For first against all soueraignty of Princes we fynd *Luther* thus

(1) *Luther de secular. potest.*

Tom. 9.

(2) *Swin. gl. som. 1. in exp. nat. art.*

41.

(3) *Calvin. in Daniel. cap. 6.*

(4) *1.*

Pe. 3.

(5) *Rom.*

13.

to wryte: Among (1) Christians, no man can, or ought to be a Magistrate; but ech one is tother equality subiect. *Swinglins* thus teacheth: *Quaruo* (2) perfide &c. When Princes do en-

and contrary to the rule of Christ, they may be upposed. To be short, in pretermittig the like Censures of *Beza* and diuers other eminent Protestants, *Calvin* in these words subscribeth to the former Protestants: *Abdicant* 3) *se potestate terreni principes* &c. Earthly Princes do deprive themselves of authority when they erect themselves against God; yea they are unworthy to be accounted in the number of men; And we had rather to spit vpon their faces,

then to obey them. Thus *Calvin*. Now how far are the Catholiks from comparting & ioyning with the former Protestants in this their doctrine of Rebellion? since we willingly remember that it is written: We (4) ought to be subiect to the King, as exceeding; And that: who 5) resisteth power, resisteth the ordinance of God. But to descend more particularly, and to parallell in part the doctrine &

the Actions, or proceedings of the Catho-
likes, and Protestants herein. The former
Protestants (with many others of their Re-
ligion) do extend this power of deposing
Princes to euery poore Parochiall Superinten-
dent, who is Pope (at least would be so) with-
in his owne Circuite or Parish; and in want
of such, to euery turbulent fellow, and to
the promiscuous multitude. The Catholike
Deuines (those I meane, who most defend
such transcendency of proceedings) do as-
cribe the doing of it to the Pope, who is a
Stranger, and therefore further of from any
such sudden attempt. To come to the At-
tempts on both sydes: The Protestants haue
actually deposed seuerall Kings, Q^{ueens}, &
Soueraignes: Thus is the King of Spayne
deposed of a great part of the Low Coun-
tries: The Kings of France heretofore of cer-
taine Cittyes in France: The Lord of Geneva
of his Territory belonging to that Cittie:
The Emperour of many Cittyes in Germany;
Finally his Maiesties Grandmother and Great
Grandmother of the kingdome of Scotland:
And all this by Protestants. The Pope and
the Catholikes haue neuer yet to this day,
actually deposed any one absolute Protestat
Prince, or King from their States & Ter-
ritories, throughout Christendome. The
greatest matters of this Nature, which can
be alledged, is the Excommunication of
king Henry the Eighth of England, Queene Eli-
zabeth his Daughter, & King Henry of France

the Fourth. The Protestants haue come into the fycld against their Catholike Princes in many huge Armyes, & hundred thousands of Men, as appeareth by the warres made by them in *the Low Countryes, France, and Germany*; The Catholiks neuer yet leuied any such Armyes against their Protestant Prince. Lattly the Protestants haue not onely depoyed their Catholike Princes of seuerall States and Countryes; but (which is far more) they haue absolutely impatronized themselves of the said States, and kept them in their owne possession, as is ouer manifestly euident by the example heretofore of *Rochell in Fance*, and at this present of *Genoua, Holland, Zeland*, and seuerall parts of *Germany, Sweneland, Transilvania &c.* The Catholikes to this very day haue not made themselves Lords of any one Towne, or Citty (much lesse of any State or kingdome) which haue belonged to their Protestant Princes. And thus far though briefly (for the more full stopping of the mouths of our Aduersaries) touching the libration & weighing in an eauen hand, the doctrine taught, and the Attempts practized, by the Protestants & Catholikes in point of Disloyalty, against their lawfull dread Soueraigns of a different Religion. And here before lend, the more fully to discouer the loyalty of the Lay Catholikes of *England*, and of vs *Priests* to his *Majesty*, our dread Soueraigne, I (the Authour of this Treatise)

tise) in the person and name of vs all, do
make bold to offer this our ensuing ioynt
prayer (as a spirituall Sacrifice) to the Al-
mighty, in behalfe of our most Worthy
King Charles, & his most illustrious Spouse
Queene Mary: God, who is the Protector of
Kings, and the first Authour of all true So-
uerainty, and supreme domination (per me (1) reges (1) Pro-
regnant) preserve them both, and their noble
issue, vnder the wings of his Diuine care & pro-
vidence: Defend them from their Enemyes, either
domesticall, or foraine; Grant vnto them a long
and most happy reigns ouer vs: And after the
dissolution of their bodies, bring their soules into
that most blessed state, where they once leaving
this terrene Kingdome, may heare those ioyfull
words of our Saviour (as spoken to them) tou-
ching their fruition of the Celestiall Kingdome:
Venite, (2) possidete paratum vobis regnum. And (1) Mat:
this our Common Prayer (most Heavenly soue-
raigne) we humbly beseech thee to heare, enuoy
the force of that title, which is peculiar to thy
self, and incommunicable to any other king, Rex
(3) regum, & Dominus dominantium. (1) Apo-
cal. 19.

Anamaduersion CLXXXII.

THE Calumny, & subtilty of our first Ad-
uersaries, in their definition of Christs
Church, was very great, and obseruable:
They (1) defined the Church to consist on-
ly of such, as are just and predestinated (but
who such are, it is not knowne to any man)
and therefore to remayne in a continuall

Latency. But what was the reason of this their proceeding? Obserue. Both the *Old* and *New Testament* giue great prayles and *Elogia* of the Church of Christ; For we read that it is called (2), *A holy City*: *A* (3) *fruitful vine*: *A* mighty 4 *high mountayne*, & (5) *Streight way*: *The only* (6) *Dome*; *The* (7) *Spouse*, & *Body* 8 *of Christ*: *The pillar of Truth* (9.) Finally (to omit much more) *that Society*, against which who is contumacious, and refractory, is to be accounted no better then a *Heathen* (10), or *Publican*. Now in regard of these *panegyricke* prayles, giuen by the *written word* of God to the Church, our first Aduersaries dared not in expresse words openly to impugne the Church; Therefore most subtilly the name of the Church they retayned, but the thing it selfe by defining it, they did ouerthrowe. For as is aboue said, they define it to consist only of the *Elect*, and *Predestinated*; and consequently (since we cannot tell, who are of the number of the *Elect*, and *predestinate*) euer to be in a hidden Latency. And to this they were forced because (as in many of the former *Animaduersiones* it is expresse) it is granted by most of our learned Aduersaries, that the Protestāt Church hath for the space of twelue or thirteene hūdred yeares, layne wholly latent & inuisible: And yet such a Church (if any such were) may be said in shew of words to be capable of the former definition of the Church. See here

(1) *Apo-*
cal. 2

(3) *Psal-*
7.

(4) *Esay*
2.

(5) *Esay*
32.

(6) *Cau-*
sic. 6.

(7) *Cant.*
4.

(8) *Ep* 5
(9) 1. *Ti*
moth. 2.

(10)
Math.

18.

the

the serpentint subtilty of our Aduerſaries.

Animaduerſion CLXXXIII.

It is to be much feared, that there are many in England who maske themſelues vnder the name of Protestants, & yet in their hearts, are no better then *Atheists*, as not acknowledging a *Deity*. Yf it chance therfore, that this *Treatise* shall come to any such mens hands, I haue purposely thought good to close it vp with certaine *Animaduerſions* for the prooffe of ſo ſupreme a Truth, wiſhing ſuch Reader to peruſe the Booke entitled, *Rowleighs Ghost*, (firſt written in Latin by the learned *Ieſuite*, *Leſſius*) for his greater confirmation, out of which booke I grant, I haue ſelected moſt of theſe enſuing *Animaduerſions*; all which of this Nature (though contrary to my Method ſhoulden hitherto in this Diſcourſe) I haue ranged together, and reduced to one head.

Now whereas ſuch men, that are tainted with ſo foule a blaſphemy, and execrable Madnes, to whom thoſe words of *Cyprian* are truly applyed: *Quæ hæc (*) ſumma delicti (*) Cyprianus, nolle illum agnoſcere, quæ ignorare non poſſit prius,* do (eſpecially if they be Schollers) hold lib. de I- that the world was not created of God, but *dolorum* was from all Eternity, therefore I will firſt *venitate*, remove this ſtumbling Block, and will purposely inſiſt only in two Arguments (or rather two vnanswerable Demonſtrations)

indisproove thereof, which lye subiect to
 each mans apprehension. First then from our
 owne experience, we reason thus: It is a
 truth confirmed by triall of all tymes, that
 the quantyies of Mens bodies haue a per-
 ceivable impayring, as also the length and
 continuance of their liues: So that, if in that
 infinite space of foregoing tyme (I meane
 from *Eternity*) Men had a being (as without
 question the world was neuer voyd of men,
 the principall and most noble member ther-
 of) then through continuall and incessant
 Decay, their bodies had beene brought be-
 fore this day to as litle a quantity, as they
 are capable of, if not cleane consumed: But
 we see, their quantity is not yet come to the
 lowest: Therefore I conclude, that they had
 not a being from *Euerlasting*.

My second Demonstration is this: Had
 this world beene from *Euerlasting*, & from
 all *Eternity*, then Infinite also had beene the
 propagation of Man: And so we should bring
 into the world an actuall *Infinite*ness, as ab-
 surd in Nature, as *Paralogismes* be in *Logicks*.
 For in this infinite space and generation,
 there had beene an infinite number of mens
 Soules, which being by Nature incapable
 of Mortality, we cannot say, that as one
 Soule was created, another was destroyed;
 And therefore it would follow, supposing
 the world to be *Ab eternis*, that there should
 be an *Infinite*ness in regard of Number, actu-
 ally subsisting in Nature. Thus farre for
 impug-

impugning, that the world cannot possibly
 exist from all *Eternity*; Omitting many o-
 ther more abstruse demonstrations, (drawne
 from Philosophy) not subject to the capa-
 city of the Ignorant.

Animaduerſion CLXXXIV.

All those Men, who deny the *Immortality*
 of Mans Soule, do withall deny a *Deity*,
 or being of God. Therefore the *Immortality*
 of the Soule is first thus proued from Natu-
 rall Philosophy; the soule of Man hath in
 it selfe, no principles or ground of Corrup-
 tion; seeing then the soule of Man (as being
 a simple Spirit) hath nothing in it selfe, fro
 which it should receaue any distraction or
 extinguishment (contrary to the sensitive
 soule of other liuing Creatures, which haue
 within it selfe the grounds of its owne Mor-
 tality;) therefore it followeth, that the soule
 of Man is immortall, and liueth, after it is
 diuorced from the body.

Another argument in prooffe hereof, is
 taken from the worth and dignity of Mans
 Soule. which dignity is chiefly discerned
 to vs, by its owne severall Operations.

For first, the knowledge of the soule is al-
 together allimitable; For it apprehendeth
 all kinds of things; As also it conceaueth
 the vniuersall reasons of things, as they are
 abstracted from particulars, from sensible
 matter, from place, and tyme &c. It scar-
 cheth into the reasons, causes, effects, and
 pro,

properties of all things ; All which Actions and operations beare no Reference to the benefit of the Body ; but are ornaments only of the Mynd , and belong only to the Mind .

Secondly , The desire of Mans soule is in like sort infinite , and boundles . For the Soule doth not only desire such things , as belong to the Body (to wit to satisfy the sense of *tasting* , and *feeling* , as Beasts do) but it stretcheth it selfe forth to euery *Truth* , desiring the knowledg and contemplation of euery Verity . Neither is the desire of the Soule (I euer meane , the soule of man) enlarged only to ech *Truth* , but also to euery thing , that is Good . Here then appeareth , how much the power of desiring in man , is eleuated and aduanced , aboue the Matter , and condition of his Body .

Thirdly , the same is further confirmed from the *Delights and Pleasures* , wherewith the Soule solaceth herselfe . For she is delighted chiefly with the contemplation of *Truth* . She is delighted with the *Pulchritude* and beauty of all things , and in admiring the *Art* and skill which appeareth in euery thing . She is delighted with *Proportions* , and Mathematicall disciplines : She is delighted with the *workes of Piety* , *Iustice* , and exercise of all other Vertues : Finally she is delighted with *Fame* , *Honour* , *glory* , *rule* & *domination* . Now , seeing none of these belongeth to the benefit of the Body , but all are touching spiri-

spirituall objects, or at least concerning such things, which are estranged from the benefit of the Body: and seeing the soule esteemeth these things far more, then any corporall Good; It therefore is most euident, that the *Soule* is of a far higher, and more worthy disposition, then the body; and of such a diuine Nature, as that it dependeth not at all of the commerce and entercourse, which she hath with the flesh.

Fourthly, This verity is warranted from the *Dominion*, which the *soule* hath over the *Body*, and from the *Soules* enioying of *Free will*. For the *Soule* doth so direct, gouerne, & overrule the body, in her affections, and passions; as that neither the expectation of rewards, or feare of torments, can force the body to say, or do any thing, then what the *Soule* willeth. Now the reason hereof is, because the *Soule* dependeth not of the *Body*, but is *autárctos*, or *sui iuris*: whereupon it riseth, that the *Soule* so smally valeweth those things which appertayne to the *Body*, as if they did not belong vnto her.

Fiftly, Yf the *Soule* should haue her dependance of the *Body*, and could not consist (the body being once extinct) then should she haue against nothing a greater horreur and auersion, then against *death*: For *death* of the body, depriuing the *soule* (supposing it to be mortall) of all good, should become her greatest infelicity, and euill; and present life her greatest good and happines. But
now

now daily experience teacheth the contrary: for many do make so small account and estimation of lyfe, as that they willingly spend it for prayse, fame, liberty, auoyding of reproach and dishonor; yea some there are, who for auoyding of disgrace or affliction of mynd, stick not to become their owne Homicides: so much do those things which appertayne to the Mind, ouerbalance all that, which appertaineth to the Body.

Sixtly, Yf the *Soule* of man be extinguished together with its body, then nothing is attended on with greater Calamities, then mans Nature; for in this life mans nature stands subiect to many afflictions, from which Beasts are most free. For it is incessantly solicited with cares, vexed with feares, burning with desires, sorrowing and complayning, neuer content with its owne state, nor enioying any tranquillity of mynd. Besides it often endureth pouerty, banishment, imprisonment, disgrace, the yoke of Matrimony, losse of goods, repentance of things past, a care of things to come &c. from all which Beasts are free. Yf therefore the *Soule* be extinguished with the body, then almost all kinds of Beasts would be more happy then *Man*. Therefore it remayneth, that the *soule* must expect its felicity after its departure from its body; & consequently, that it dyeth not with the body, but is immortal. For how absurd is it,

that, that which is of the *biggest Nature* in
this world, should in its state and being be-
come more miserable, then things of a far
smaller Nature?

Sequently, That sentence, which is the
source and wellspring of all *Iustice, Piety, &*
Vertue, cannot possibly be false; But this
Article, which teacheth the *Soules* immor-
tality, and that after this life it is to be re-
warded, or punished, is the ground-work
of all *Iustice* and *probity*; therefore the arti-
cle of the *soules* immortality is most true: as
on the contrary part, that Opinion, which
teacheth the *soule* to be mortall, and cor-
ruptible, doth subuert and ouerthrow the
foundation of all *probity* and *vertue*; there-
fore that Opinion must of necessity be false,
since it promiseth a man, that (let him live
neuer so wickedly) he shall not suffer any
paynes after this life.

Rightly (to remit the Reader for his
fuller satisfaction herein, to the foresaid
booke of *Rawleighs Ghost*) I say, that *Nature*
which is *intelligent*, is the worthyest nature
of all others which are in the world. Hecce
it is gathered, that it is absurd to maintaine,
this *Nature* utterly to perish and to be mor-
tall; For if the earth, sea, and starres; all
which were created for the vse of this *in-*
telligent nature (I meane for man) do neuer
decay, but continue eternall; then how
can it be auerred, that this *intelligent nature*
should become mortall and passible? Cer-
tainly

tainly it is altogether vnlawfull to affirm, that *nature* (to wit *Mans soule*) to be mortal, to which things, that are immortal, become seruiceable, and for whose only vse and benefit, the said immortal things were first created.

Animaduerſion C L X X X V.

THe Consideration of the *fabrick of Mans body* most irresistably conuceedh vs to the knowledge of a *Deity*; And therefore not vnderſeruedly is the body of man ſtilled by the Philoſophers, *Microcoſmus*, the *leſſer World*: Meaning leſſer in Quantity, then all this great world, contayning in it the vniuerſality of all ſublunary things; but farre greater with reference to the many myſteryes diſcouered in the framing therof. Firſt then *Mans body* (but briefly to runne over ſome chiefe obſeruazions) is made not of one bone, but of ſeueral bones, the better thereby to bend himſelfe; Some of which bones are greater, ſome leſſe: of all which every one hath that particular magnitude, ſhape, firmenes, and connexion, which the ſtrength of the body, the facility of moving, and the vse of the members require. Theſe bones (eſpecially the greateſt of them) do further ſerue in *Mans body*, to ſupport the ſame; with the like vse as the great columnes and beames, do vphould an Edifice, or buylding: And every bone is covered with a peece of fleſh, which is called *Muſculus*, which

which *Muscle* endeth in a sinewy-matter, called *Tendo*: By the *Tendo* the *Muscle*, and consequently the *Bone* belonging therto, is moued.

We will in this next place consider the three principall parts of mans body: to wit, the *Hart*, the *Liner*, and the *Brayne*. It is a principle in *Anatomy*, that all *Veynes* proceed from the *Liner*, and giue nourishment; All *Arteries* from the *Hart*, and giue Life; All *Sinews* from the *Brayne*, and giue Motion and sense. The meaning hereof is, that the grosse blood in the veynes doth giue nourishment; The Spirituall Blood in the Arteries, Lyfe; And the Animall Spirits in the Nerves or Sinews, do giue sense and Motion. Now the *Arteries*, *Veynes*, and *Sinews*, are of a reasonable greatnes, as their first proceeding from their sources or heads; but then they deuide themselves almost into infinite branches, and in the end they become so small, as that therefore they are called *Capillares*, with reference to the smallnes of the hayre of a Mans head. They are so generally dispersed throughout all the parts of a *Mans body*, as that therefore there is no part of the Body, but that it hath nourishment, life, and sense or Motion. Add hereto that motion of the Hart, which is called *Systole*, and *Diastole*, is most admirable. By *Diastole*, or Dilatation of it selfe, the Hart drawes in new Ayre to temper the Heate, & refresh the Spirits; by *Systole*, or compression

of it selfe, it expells all fuliginous vapors. And thus are the Arteries throughout the whole body euer moued with an incessant and continuall vicissitude, in dilating and contracting themselues, euen for the said End. And this *Systole*, and *Diastole* of the Arteries through the body, is that, which vulgarly is called, *the beating, or Motion of the Pulse*.

Animaduerſion CLXXXVI.

IN this next Animaduerſion, I will deſcend more particularly to the Structure of two principall Organs, or members of mans body, To wit, the *Eye*, and the *Hand*; in the framing of either of which there appeareth an vndoubted certainty of a *Divine providence*, or *deity*, by whom they were ſo miraculoſly made and compacted.

I will begin with the *Eye*; the knowledg of which Inſtrument is of ſuch worth, as that it hath purchaſed a peculiar Name, or appellation to it ſelfe; It being called, *Art Optica*, The Art concerning the eye & light.

Now touching the *Eye*, Firſt we may obſerue the *bearing out of the forehead & the noſe*, ſeruing to beate back all ſudden entrance of things hurtfull to the *Eye*. Next the *Hayres* of the *Eyelids*, placed in precise manner, ſeruing to the foreſayd End. Then the *Eyelids* themſelues, which do ſhut and open, either for the preuenting of the entrance of things

things domageable, or for the receauing in of pleasing Objects. Next are to be considered the many *Tunica*, or *Skins*, which do encompass and fortify the Eye. The *Tunica* are these: First (and the outwardmost) *Adnata*, otherwise called *Alba*. Next *Immembrata*. Then *Cornea*. Next *Uvea*, by which the eyes of seuerall men appeare to be of seuerall colours. Then *Retina*; and lastly *Aranca*, it being a most thin skin, and nearest to the Eye.

In this next place, are to be considered the three *Humors* of the Eye; to wit *Aqueus*, which is the vttermost part of the Eye; *Crystallinus*, which is placed in the Middle of the Eye; and this humor is almost the chiefest Instrument of seeing, and therefore it is called *Simulacrum visionis*. The third Humor is *Vitreus*, which is placed in the inmost part of the Eye. Thus the *Crystalline* Humour is betweene the *Aqueus*, and the *Vitreus*. By the help of these *Humors*, the Eye receaueth nourishment, as also by them it purgeth away all hurtfull ordure & filth. Next are presented to our consideration the two *Optick Synes*, which serue to conuay the *Species* of Objects from the Eye to the *Common sense*: They are called *Nervi visibiles*:

Now touching the figure of the Eye, it is partly *Round*, that so the Eye may see not only straight forward, but also somewhat on both sydes, as we obserue it doth. Lastly concerning the manner how we see; The o-

pinions of the learned are two; to wit, either *Extramittendo* (as they speak) that is, the eye sendeth forth certaine *visibiles Spirits* to the *Object* which it seeth, and then they returne back againe to the *Eye*, with the true forme of the said *Object*. Or els it seeth *intromittendo* (which is the more common opinion) that is, the *Species*, or formes of the *Object* are spherically multiplied in the *Aire*, or water, and are receaued into the *Eye per modum Conoidis*, v^z. in a pyramidall manner. Thus much touching the *Eye*. To come to discourse of the *Hand*, and of the admirable Artifice discovered therein: Three things are chiefly to be considered in the *hand*, to wit, *The number of the fingers*; *The number of the ioynts* of euery finger; and the *different length of each finger*.

Touching the *Number* of the fingers. They are fyue with the Thumbe. Here then we may obserue the fitting number of them: For if there were more fingers then fyue; then what is more then fyue would be superfluous; for we cannot conceaue to what vse, that finger exceeding the number of fyue, could be put vnto. Yt fewer then fyue, then the number would be defectiue; and so the *hand* could not perfectly perform its operation, as we see, it falleth out in such men, who by misfortune haue lost one or more of their fingers.

To proceed to the *Number of the ioynts* of each finger. All the foure fingers haue three ioynts,

ioynts, whereby they exercise so many inflexions: The *Thumbe* hath only two. Yf any finger had lesse then three ioynts, then could not the *hand* so aptly performe its faculty; as we may obserue in those persons, who haue any of their fingers growne stiffe through any disease. Yf the *Thumbe* had three ioynts, that third ioynt would be meere superfluous, and of no vse.

To descend to the *different length* of the fingers, & the *Thumbe*. We are here to call to mynd, that the whole *hand* performeth its faculty by drawing and closing (as it were in a circular forme) either all, or some of the fyue fingers together; for by that manner it best graspeth, or houldeth any thing within it. Now here I say, that if either the *long finger* were shorter then it is, with reference to the other fingers, or the *little finger*, and the *Thumbe* longer then they are, then this supposed shortnes in the *longest finger*, and length in the *little finger*, and *Thumbe*, would cause the *hand* to be far lesse apt & fit, for compressing it selfe together, or houlding of any thing within it. Now here who doth contemplate all these things touching the *hand*, in the curious frame whereof nothing is superfluous and redundant, nothing wanting or defectiue; how can he rest otherwise perswaded, but that all this is framed by a *Divine Providence*, which is God; who worketh all things with most admirable exactnes in *Mensura, Numero, & Pondero*;

dere, as the *wiseman* sayth, *Sap. cap. ii.*

To come to another most obseruable point, which is this following. As it appeareth in the Fabrick of the *Eye* and of the *Hand*, so also in all bodyes (whether they be the Heauens, the foure Elements, the Plants, Beasts, and mans body) euery thing is made with reference to some *extrinsecall End*, to the which end the whole structure of the thing, as also all its parts, and faculties of its parts, are (after a wonderfull manner) disposed and framed. Therefore of Necessity there must be some one most *wyse Mynd*, or *Spirit*, which aforehand conceaued in it selfe all those *Ends*, and ordayned proportionable, and fitting *Meanes* to the said *Ends*. For *Nature*, which is not capable of *Reason*, nor endued therewith, as it cannot conceaue or comprehend the *End* of things; so neither can it dispose, or set downe suitable *meanes* to the said *Ends*, since this is a chiefe worke of Art and wisdom. I will exemplify this (for breuity) only in the *Sunne*. The *Sunne* is not made for it selfe (for it cannot apprehend or reflect vpon its owne Beauty, and Fayrenes) but for the good and benefit of other things; to wit, that it may enlighten the world, & cherish all things with its heate. This then being thus, the *Sunne* ought to haue a certaine proportion or measure of *light*, and quantity; as also a determinate *Place* in the world; lest that the *light* being ouer radiant, shyn-

ning, and great, or it selfe in Place over
 neare, it should burne the Earth: or on the
 contrary syde, the *light* being too remisse
 and small, or too farre off from the Earth,
 should not sufficiently lighten it, or heate
 it. Now this disposition of fitting *Quantity*,
light, and *place*, cannot be assigned by Any,
 but only by such a *Mynde* or *Spirit*, as is
 able to consider the *End*, and the *Meanes*, &
 of Iudgment to set downe a sorting and
 convenient proportion betweene them:
 And this *Spirit* or *Mynd* we call *God*. The
 same might be exemplified in all other
 things (herefore for breuity omitted.) For
 there is nothing idle in this world, but all
 things tend, and direct their operations to
 some *End*; And they incline, and bend to
 their *End* so ordinatly, and with such con-
 venient wayes, and passages, as that it can-
 not be bettered by any Art whatsoever.
 Wherefore seeing the things themselues (as
 voyde of *Reason*) can neither perceave the
Ends, wherunto they are directed, neither
 the *Meanes*, nor the proportion of the *Mea-*
nes, by the which they are directed; it is
 therefore most certaine, that all things are
 directed by some *Superiour power*, who seeth
 and considereth both the *Meanes* and the
Ends; and this *Superiour power* is *God*, to whom
 be all *Glory and Honour* for all *Eternity*.

Animaduerſion CLXXXVII.

THediuersity of *Faces*, and *Voyces* of Men is a strong Argument to proue the ear of a *Divine Providence*. And touching the first. The diuersity of *Faces* is so multiplicitious, and almost to infinite in Man (so ordained to be by *God*) as that it affordeth an vnanswerable argument of a *Deity*: For without this variety of *Faces*, neither could Iustice be obserued, neither could any forme of a *Commonwealth* subsist: For suppose men to be in Countenance a like (as sheep, Oxen, kye, Crowes, sparrows, and many other Creatures of the same nature or kind are) then most ineuitable perturbations and tumults would ensue. For neither could married Men discern their own wyues from other women, nor their wyues their husbands from other men; neither the parents their Children, neither the Creditours their debtours, the friends their Enemies, nor the Magistrate the delinquents, nor the subiects the Prince. And therefore each *Commonwealth* would be infested with adulteries, incests, frauds, proditions, murders, and all wickednes whatsoever; since every one through a resemblance of *Face*, might giue himselfe forth, for whom he would. It cannot be replied, that this difference of *Faces*, cometh not from any *Providence*, so disposing the same; but only by chance, and eualty: This is absurd to say

fin.

Since vpon this answer, it would follow,
that all Iustice, and true Policy, which is
found among men, should be grounded on-
ly vpon *Chance*.

Furthermore, what proceedeth from
Chance, is not perpetuall, but rarely hap-
peth, as the Philosophers do teach; But we
find, that difference of Countenances and
Faces, is nota thing strange and rare, but
most ordinary and common. Therefore this
difference of *Faces*, is not ascribed to chan-
ce, but to some *high Providence*, which hath
ordayned the same, the better to preserue
Iustice, and Ciuill Life among Men.

Neither among Men, is there only this
variety of faces (for their better discerning
of one from another) but also of *Voyces*; so
as there is no lesse difference among Men
in sound of *Voyce*, then in Countenance.
For seeing a precise and distinct knowledg
necessarily condueth to the preseruing of
Iustice; Therefore the *Divine Providence*
(God I meane) hath so disposed, that there
should be a disparity and vnlikenes not on-
ly in *Faces*, but also in *Voyces*; that so by a
double sense (to wit, by sight, & hearing)
as by a double witnes, one man should be
made knowne from another. For if but one
of these disparities were, then perhaps some
mistaking might be; but where both of
them do ioynly concur and meete, it is al-
most impossible, that men herein should be
in both decaued. Thus far of the *Divine*

Providence, most clearely manifested, in ordainning the diuersity of *Faces*, and *voices* in Men, for the preservation of Iustice, and mantayning of a good Commonwealth.

Animaduersion C L X X X V I I I

THe vndoubted Truth of a *Deity* is alio demonstrated from this ensuing Reason: It is euident euen by infinite Examples, and long experience, that there are certaine *Inuisible Substances*, endued with *Vnderstanding*, and penetrating all things through their subtilty of Nature, & which do transcend, & exceed all humane power & wisdom. This is manifest by the *Oracles* and *Answeres*, which were giuen in former tymes, by the *Idolls* in all Countreyes. For those *Statues* and *Images* (as wanting altogether lyfe, and sense) could not returne any Answer; but it was the *Spirits*, or deuills entering into those *Statues*, which so answered. Such were the *Oracles* of *Apollo* at *Delphos*, and of *Iupiter*, of *Mammon*, and diuers others in former ages: and by this means the *Deuills* did propagate *Idolatry*. And euen at this day, the deuills are in this manner honored in *India*, *China*, *Iapon*, *Tartary*, *Brasil*, *Peru* &c. The same point of being of deuills, is further made euident from the doctrine and practise of *Nieromanticks*, *Magi* or *Wizards*, and *Witches*, which swarme in all Countreyes. For these through certaine *Ceremonies* and *Verses*, are able to call up

denills, and do cause, that they do not
shew strange effects (which necessarily
imply their preence) but also make them to
peare in a visible forme. Yea heere in En-
and in *Lancashire*, about some six or sea-
n and twenty yeares since, there were ap-
prehended about twenty witches, all confes-
ing their witchcraft by help of the deuill, &
hanged at *Lancaster*. In like manuer some
three yeares since, or there abouts, there
were certaine witches apprehended in the
shire, and condemned to death by the
judges of that Circuite. Thirdly, the same
erity of *Spirits*, or *Denills*, is euicted from
those, who are called *Energumeni*, or posses-
sed persons: for two things appeare in them
which are aboue humane power: One, that
such, as are possessed, do speake strange
Tongues, which themselves do not under-
stand; The other, that they do discouer
things secret; or do relate things done in
great distance of place, as if they saw them
openly: But these two things afford an eu-
dent demonstration of a certaine Superiour
Inuisible Nature, by the power whereof they
are performed. To conclude, this point of
being of *Spirits*, is further euicted from the
many apparitions of *Spirits*, which are af-
firmed to haue been, from the testimony of
many most probable Histories.

Now then, if there be *Incorporeall Sub-
stances*, or *Spirits*, (and these many in num-
ber, as certayne they are many in number)
then

then it inevitably may be concluded; that there is one *supreme Spirit*, to the which the rest are subiect, and at whose command they all are governed; since every multitude of things (except there be a dependency, and subordination to one *most High*) begetteth disorder and Confusion. This point is further proved from the most dangerous inconueniences, accompanying the contrary doctrine. For if among *Spirits* there were no Order, & that the rest should not be subiect vnto one, at the command whereof the power of them were not to be restrayned; then might every one of them afflict and trouble the World at his owne pleasure, might take away mens goods, yea even their Lyues, burne, and destroy all things, finally might ouerthrow all mankind; neither could any redresse be found to the contrary. Now this *supreme Spirit*, to which they are all subiect, we call *God*, who at his pleasure, is able to restrayne and bridle the forces, and power of all the rest.

Well then, seeing there are many *Spirits*, I here demand, from whence this Multitude had its beginning? or who brought them in to the World? They proceed not from Bodies, in that they are of a more excellent Nature then bodies are; as also in that bodies do bring forth only bodies. Neither is one of them ingendred of another; seeing this kind of generation is peculiar to things, which are subiect to corruption; to wit,

that by these meanes the *Species* and
kinds of things may be perpetuated, whi-
ch the Nature, being extinct in the Parent,
is conserued in the Illue. Neither lastly can
it be said, that euery one of these *Spirits*
depend their being from themselues, so as they
depend of no other Cause; Since granting,
that any thing receaueth its existence & be-
ing from it selfe, it is farre more probable,
that this so taking its existence, should be
but One, not *Many*. Therefore I conclude,
that this, which taketh its being & existece
from it selfe, is but one, to wit *God* alone,
who is the *supremie spirit* of all, & who gaue
creation, existence, and being to all other
Spirits; be they either good, or wicked
by all *Spirits*.

Animaduersion CLXXXIX.

Cardinall Bellarmyne in his booke, *De as-
censione Mentis ad Deum, per scalas rerum
mundarum*, taketh his second *scala* or *Degree*,
from the consideration of the fabrick of this
whole world, and the things created and
contayned therein.

Now in this *great world*, which cōprehen-
deth all things within it, these things fol-
lowing are most wonderfull; to wit, the
Magnitude of the world; *Multitude* of things
Created; *Variety* of things; *Efficacy* or ver-
tue of things; lastly, *Beauty* of things. The
which seuerall Heads being with earnest at-
tention pondered, haue great force, so to
elevate

eleuaze the soule of man, as that it shal be
uen absorpt in the admiration of a certain
immense *Magnitude, Multitude, Variety, Ex-
tensity, and Palschritude*; all which is God him
selfe.

To beginne. 1. The *Magnitude* of the Earth
only, is so great, as that in so many thousand
of yeares since the Creation of the world
yet the whole *superficies* of the Earth remay-
nes vndiscovered from Man. Now what is
the whole bignes of the Earth, if it be com-
pared to the compasse and *Magnitudo* of the
Highest Heauen? It is accounted by the As-
tronomers to be but (as it were) a Poynt,
and this with iust Reason: For we obserue,
that the beames of the Sunne by the inter-
position of the Earth do so reach & pierce
the Stars, opposite to the Sunne, as if the
Earth were Nothing. Furthermore if euery
Starre in the firmament (according to the
iudgement of the Learned) be greater then
the whole Orbe of the Earth, & yet through
the almost infinite distance of the Starres,
they seeme in our Eyes most litle; who then
can in thought arriue to the greatnes of the
Heauens, wherein so many thousands of
Starres do shyne? Therefore if we reade in
Ecclesiasticus (1): *Latitudinem terre, & profun-
dum Abissi, quis dimensus est*; what then
shall we conceaue of the exteriour *superficies*
of the Heauen, & of the deyth or profun-
dity of the whole world, from the highest
Heauen, to the Center of the Earth? Cer-
tainly

(1) *Ecclesiasticus*.
c. 1. ca. 1.

mainly the corporall greatnes of the whole world is of that immensity, as that no thought or cogitation of man, can comprehend it.

2. The *Multitude* of things created by God, who can number? For how many Metalls of gould, silver, brasse, lead, precious stones are within the Earth and the Sea? And how many *Species*, kynds, and *Individua* of hearbs, flowers, and plants are upon the Earth, and how many parts are in them? In lyke sort how many kinds, *Species*, and *Individua* of perfect, and imperfect Creatures, as of fourefooted Beasts, of creeping Wormes; of flying Creatures? And what may we say of the *Multitude* of Men since the first Creation? To conclude, how many starres are there in Heauen and how many Angells about the Heauens? And of the starres thus we read: (2) *Numerus Stellarum* si (1) *Genes.* Now here we are to obserue, that God would haue himselfe knowne of Man in some sort, and because not any one Creature could aptly represent the infinite perfection of the Creatour; therefore God did multiply Creatures, and gaue a certaine goodnes and perfection to euery Creature; that thereby iudgment might be made of the goodnes and perfection of the Creatour, who containeth infinite perfections vnder the perfection of one most simple Essence: Even as one peece of gold containeth the value and worth of many peeces of silver.

3. Tou-

3. Touching the *Variety of Creatures*; we are to conceaue, that though the *Multitude* of things created doth argue a multiplicitious perfection of one God; notwithstanding the *Variety* of things which appeareth in this multiplication, is far more admirable, and sooner leadeth man to the knowledge of God, Scing to vary formes almost after an infinite manner, (which God hath done in the Creation of things) is a most diuine worke, and most worthy of admiration. I do omit the kynds and *species* of things, which are most various and diuers. How great a disparity is there in the *Judici-
da* of hearbs, plants, flowers, & fruites? Are not the formes, colours, smells, sapours or tastes of them diuersified almost after an infinite maner? And is not the like to be obserued in liuing Creatures? To speake only of Men; In a huge Multitude of Men, there cannot be two found altogether like. The which poynt is in like manner obseruable in Starrs, and Angels: for we reade, (3. *Stella à stella differt in claritate.* And S. Thomas (4) affirmeth, that the Angels, (though they exceed all corporall things in number) do differ among themselves, not only, *Indiniana Numero*, but also *forma/specifica*.

Here next followeth, to speake of the *vertue* and *efficacy*, which God hath implanted in all things created; that thereby we may better ascend to vnderstand the *infinito*

VERTUE

(3) 1.
Cor. xij.
(4) 1.
Par.
quaest.
90. a. 2.
4.

vertue of the *Creator*; ſeing there is nothing
 created, which hath not an admirable ver-
 tue, or power, or efficacy. A peece of earth
 or ſtone falling downe from a great height,
 with what a force doth it deſcend? The wa-
 ter, which gently and mildly ſlydeth vpon
 the *ſuperſicies* of the earth, when it ſwell-
 eth in floods, or torrents, ouerthroweth all
 things in its way, as houſes, wals of Cittyes,
 and the like. The *Wynds*, which at other
 tymes moſt ſweetly breathe, do caſt great
 ſhips vpon the *Rockes*, and pull vp by
 the rootes Old huge *Oakes*. In lyke ſort,
 the fyre doth inſtantly increaſe into ſo gre-
 at a flame, as that it euen deuoureth houſes,
 and woods in a moment of tyme. To deſ-
 cend to *Hearbs*; How various are their ver-
 tues? Touching *ſtones*, and particularly the
Lodſtone, what admirable vertue is diſco-
 uered therein. To conclude, touching *li-
 uing Creatures*, we ſee ſome of them to be
 moſt ſtrong, as Lyons, Beares, Bulls &c. O-
 thers (though moſt litle) yet moſt witty, as
 Aunts, ſpiders, Bees, Apes, and the like. I
 here omit the power of the Angels, the ver-
 tue of the Sunne and Stars; and reſt in the
Wis of Men, by the which ſo many Arts are
 inuented, as that we haue ſome Reaſon to
 doubt, whether *Nature* doth ſurmount *Art*, or
Art Nature?

It remayneth, that in this place we take
 into our conſideration, the *pulchritude* &
beauty of things created, according to thoſe

(5) *Pfal.* words of the psalmist: (5) *Delectasti me Domine in factura.* And truly, as all things are good, which God made, so also are they all fayre. For example, the beauty of a springing Garden, of an Orchard well cultivated, is great; great also is the beauty of the calme Sea, of Riueres, of a cleare Element, or Ayre, of the Heauens shyning with innumerable stars, as adorned with so many precious gems. Great also is the beauty of the formes of seuerall kynds of beasts, the flying of Byrds, and sporting of fishes. What shall a Man say of the pulchritude of the *Stars*, and *Moone*, but especially of the most cleare, and most great light of the *Sunne*, which exhilarateth & cherisheth the whole world with its Ryling?

(6) *Eccl.*
cl. 1. 1.
cap. 9.

To conclude, how great is the beauty & forme of *Men*, and *Women*. Many Men (otherwys graue and wyse) haue bene euen bewitched with the fayre faces of women, according to those words: *Propter (6) speciem mulierum multi perierunt.* In like sort many modest women haue descended vnto that madnes, as that for the beauty & good personage of men, they haue endangered their states, dignities, reputation, children, parents, life it selfe, yea their owne soules, for the loue and enioying of such men, as they did hould to be fayre, & of comelines of grace.

Thus farre of these five poynts; to wit, of the *Magnitude*, *Multiplicity*, *Variety*, *vertue*, & *Beauty*

Beauty of things created; the intense and serious consideration whereof, may much further Man, as above is said, to the contemplation of God, from whom only all these do streame and flowe.

Animadversion C C.

The *Psalms* admonisheth vs in these words: *Querite (1) Deum, & uiuet anima (1) Psal. vestra.* True it is, that during our peregrination here, we are not able to fynd out, and perfectly discerne what God is; since we read that God, (2); *Luxem habitat inaccessibilem.* (2) *L. Ti.* Neuerthelesse the nearest meanes for vs to discerne what God, in his owne Essence, is, may be taken from the contemplation of *Mans Soule*. In regard then hereof I will in this *Animaduersion* briefly contract, what the learned *Carainall Belarmine* hath deliuered of this poynt; making the consideration of the *Soule* of man his (3) *Eight Degree or scale*, to arriue (in part) to the knowledge of God; in regard of the great similitude in many poynts, which the *soule* of Man beareth to God. And to beginne with these Resemblances.

First then, the *Soule of Man* is a *spirit*, that
is, an incorporeall Subitance; so *God* is a *spi-*
rit, for we reade, (4) *Spiritus est Deus*: Yet
here is the difference, that *God* is a spirit in-
created, & the *Creator*; The *soule of man*, (4) loan,
a spirit also, but *Created*.

Secondly, The *soule of Man*, because it is

a simple Spirit, is therefore *immortall*; since it hath nothing in it selfe, from whence it may receaue its corruption (cōtrary to the scoules of beasts, or irrationall Creatures) yet the disparity herein also is, that the *Soule of Man* sometymes was not; and only through the will & pleasure of *God* arriueth to its essence and being; and by the will of the same *God*, may be reduced to nothing, though in it selfe it hath not (as aboue is said) any cause or principle of its Corruption; But *God* himselfe is not only *Immortall*, but also *sempiternall*; and therefore with reference to *sempiternall Immortality* (as I may tearme it) it was truly said of the Apostle, speaking of *God*, *Qui solus (5) habet immortalitatem*.

Thirdly; The *soule of man* is endued with the light of *Vnderstanding* and *Reason*. For it knoweth not onely colours, sapours, smels, sounds, Heate, Cold, and the rest, which lye open to the senses of the body; But it doth also iudge of the substance of things; and of things, not onely *singular*, but *vniversal*; and doth not know things only present, but also cōiectureth of things *to come*; and by discourse ascendeth to the Heauens, obseruing and demonstrating the particular *phaynomena*, or Apparences of their Motions. In like sort, she searcheth the effects out of the Causes, and from the effects recurs to the Causes: Thus we here see, that the *souls of man*, is lyke to *God*, and
vnlyke

only ke to Beasts. Now here the *soule of man* differeth from God: for the *soule of man* is (as is said) endued with the light of *Intelligence* or *understanding*; but *God is the Intelligence* or *light it selfe*. The *soule* runneth by discourse from the Causes to the effects, and from the effects to the Causes; and thus not without great labour getteth some knowledge: *God* with one simple view or aspect behouldeth all things perfectly. The *soule of man* vnderstandeth those things, which do exist, and already haue a Being; and therefore his knowledge dependeth vpon the being of things: *God* by vnderstanding, maketh, that things be; and herein the existence of things dependeth vpon the knowledg of *God*. The *Soule* doth with an vncertainty, only coniecture of things future; *God* doth no lesse euidently discern things future, then things past, and present. The *soule* needeth many things to exercise the faculty of vnderstanding, as the *Object*, the *Species*, the *Phanthasma*, and the like: *God* needeth nothing, for euen his *Essence* it selfe, is all things to him; and which is more, his *Essence* is to him his *vnderstanding*. To conelude, the *Soule*, whiles it is in the Body, doth not only see, not *God*; neither doth she see the *Angells*, nor her selfe; neither doth she properly and truly see any Substance, though corporall; and in many things she is ignorant, and hath a true knowledge but of few things: *God* is ignorant of nothing; neither is he in any thing

thing deceaued, or erreth, according to those words: *Omnia nuda sunt, & aperta oculis eius.* Hebr. c. 4.

Fourthly, there appeareth in *Mans Soule* another kind of knowledg, which consists not in *Speculation*, but in *Action*. And from hence proceed so many Bookes of Philosophers, touching vices and vertues; so many Lawes of Princes & Magistrats, to teach a man to liue well; in all which there is discovered an admirable light of Reason in man, by the which he most far differeth from Beasts: But all these are nothing to the *Eternall Law*; which flourisheth in the mind of the *Creator*; from whom, as from a most streaming fountaine, do flow all Lawes and decrees, according to those words, *Unus (6) est legislator, & Index, Deus.*

(6) Iacob. 1.

Fifthly, the *Soule of Man* doth possesse a third kind of knowledg, resting in ingeniously fabricating and working of things. For whereas Beasts do make their Nests, Denss &c by a certaine instinct, euer after the same manner; *The soule of man* (as being indued with reason, and iudgment) hath inuented innumerable Arts, by the which she so ouer-ruleth and commandeth ouer all other liuing Creatures; as that neither Wings can be safty inough to Birds, nor the depth of the water to fishes; neither strength to Lyons or Beares, but that they all are subiect, to be taken by the wit of *Mans Soule*. In like manner the light of the

wit of Mans Soule wonderfully shineth in in-
 uenting the *Art of Navigation*, where it
 hath taught ships loaden with most heauy
 burdens, not only by the help of Oares *to*
runne (as it were) but also by meanes of the
 sayles, as with wings, *to flye*. Finally (to omit
 diuers other points) what dexterity of mans
 wit appeareth in the *Art of pictureing* or draw-
 ing, by the which things are so liuely ex-
 pressed to the Eye, as if themselves did tru-
 ly enjoy lyfe? But here we may turne our
 Eye back to *God*, in whom there is the true
 source of Wisdom: the Caufer of things; &
 what wit appeareth to be in Man, all the
 same is deriued from the said fountayne: for
 if we wonder at mans wit, in that it can mai-
 ster and rule ouer beasts; much more we are
 to admire *God*, to whom all things are o-
 bedient. And if it seeme strange, that man
 should inuent so many Arts of sayling, build-
 ing of Edifices &c. much more strange
 should it seeme, that *God* by his wisdom &
 power did create Heauen and Earth, and all
 things therein. Finally, if we rest astonished
 at the Art of paynting, or drawing mens fa-
 ces and fauours; much more cause haue we
 to rest astonished at the Art of the Creatour;
 who of Earth framed a true & liuing Man,
 and from the Rib of the man, made the first
 Woman. And this we are to admire with
 more reason, in that, what things Man doth
 make, he cannot make without *God* coope-
 rating with man; whereas what things *God*

maketh, the same are made only by him, without the cooperation, or assistance of any other.

Sixtly, The *Soule of Man* is indued with *Freedom of Will*, which is common to him with *God*, and the *Angells*, and by which man differeth from all other things created; This *Freedom of Will*, is an admirable dignity in *Mans* *soule*; yet the worth thereof is far more noble in *God*; For first the freedom of *Mans* *will* is weake; it also is easily enclined to choose things that are *Evill*; whereas the *Freedom of the Divine Will*, is most stronge, and cannot possibly encline it selfe to any *Evill*. Furthermore, our *Freedom of Will*, is indeed so free, as that it is able to will, or not to will; but it is not of power euer to effect that, which it willet, or to prevent that, which it selfe willet not, according to those words of the Apostle, Rom. 7. *Non quod volo bonum, hoc facio; sed quod nolo malum, hoc ago*. But the *Freedom of the Will of God*, is so conioyned with a full and absolute power, as that of him it is said *Psal. 113. Omnia quaecunque voluit, fecit*.

Seuently, and lastly; The *soule of man*, is after a wonderfull manner in mans body. For since the *Soule of man*, is an indiuisible Spirit, it is therefore whole in the whole body, and whole in euery part thereof (contrary to the being of the *soules of Beasts*,) which are *Materiall*, and extended to the extension of their bodies. Thus the *Soule of*
Man

Man replenisheth the whole body, yet it possesseth no place in the body; and when the body doth increase, the *Soule* doth not increase, but beginneth to be there, where afore it was not. And if a member of the body be cut of, or become withered & dry, the *Soule* is not lessened, nor dried, but ceaseth to be in that member, wherein afore it was, without any detriment or maymednes thereof. This is the true glasse of the existence of *God* in things created; for *God* is an *indivisible Spirit*; and yet replenisheth the whole world, and all the parts thereof; yet possesseth he no place, but is whole in the whole world, and whole in every part thereof. And when a new creature is produced; *God* beginneth to be in it; neither yet is *God* moved; and when any creature is destroyed, or dyeth, *God* is not thereby destroyed, or dyeth, but ceaseth to be there, & this without any *Motion of place*. Thus in these former points *God*, and the *Soule of Man* do agree; But in many other points, *God* (as there is iust Reason) hath the prerogative, and preheminance. For that the *Soule of Man* to be in the body, it is necessary, that it becommerh the *Forme* of the body, and that so it be ioyned with the body, as that one man be made of the body and the *Soule*. But it is not needfull, that *God* should become the *Soule* of the world; neither that of him and the world one *compounded substance* should be made; For *God* out of his *immensi-*

ity is in every place; out of his *indivisible unity*, is whole wheresoeuer he is; and out of his *Omnipotency*, doth gouerne, support, and moue all things.

Furthermore the *Soule of Man*, though it may be said to be in the whole body, yet properly it is not, but in such parts of the body, as haue lyfe; and therefore it is not in the Humours, in the Hayres of the heade, in the nayles. But *God* is absolutely in 'al things, and not only in corporall, but euen in spirituall things: for it is impossible, that any thing should be, in which *God* is not. Lastly, the *Soule* is not, but in the body, and that being but small and of a narrow compasse, so as the parts thereof (during the staying of the *Soule* therin) must be continued and ioyned together; for if any part of the body be separated or deuided from the rest, in that part, or member so deuided, the *Soule* cannot be. But *God* is whole euen in the Vniuersity, or frame of all things created; though that frame be great, and the parts thereof become separated, and deuided asunder. Yea if a second, or third World (or more) should be created, *God* would be in them all, and in every part of them; for *where God should not be, there nothing should be*. So true are those words of Holy writ 2. Par. 6. *Caelum & Cell Caelorum non te capiunt*. Thus far touching the similitude & resemblance, which the *Soule of Man* hath with his *Creator*; the similitude being so great (as is a-

bous

houe touched) as that there is no other way, by the which a man may more easely ascend to know in part, what God is, then from the consideration, or contemplation, what the *Soule of Man* is; with so iust reason we read it said by God himself, when he first created Man: *Let vs make man in our Image, according to our lykenes. Genes. 1.* And with this I impose an end to these my *Animadversions*.

A *Parenetickall Conclusion* to the younger Sort of Priests, and Students of the English Seminaries; exhorting them to the study of *Controuersies*, in *Fayth*, and *Religion*.

THus farre (*Reuerend Friends*, and *Brethren*) you see, I haue proceeded in this *Miscellane*, and indigested *Tract*. These *Animadversions* may serue, as certaine prelibations or foretastes of *Controuersies* in fayth. Yf so you shall reape profit thereby, O how abundantly shall I hould my small labour therein taken, to be recompenced? but if they should not find that full successe with you, which I desire, yet let your charitable acceptance (in part) imitate the *Abysmall*, and bottomlesse charity of God; who placeth a good intention only (where further Ability, or other Circumstances are wanting) and a good worke actually,

actually performed, in one, and the same ballance. But now before my pen giues you its last farewell, let me take leaue (with your good allowance) to expatiate a little in discourse, thereby to perswade you the more forcibly to the particular study of *English Controversies in sayth and Religion*: Prouince, or charge most peculiarly (in my iudgment) incumbent vpon you, in regard of your mayne projects & determinations espoused (as I may say) to the *Saluation of soules*.

You are hereafter, in *England*, to encounter with Protestants (your professed Adversaries in sayth:) Imitate then a skilfull Generall in the warres, who laboureth not only to hinder his Enemies attempts and approaches, but withall seeketh to assault his Enemyes. So here you haue vndertaken both a *Defensine*, as also an *Offensine* War: prepare your selues then, not only to maintaine by way of disputation and proofes, your owne Catholike Religion; but be also prest, (which is partly coincident with the former) by all forces, both Diuine & humane, to make violent incurSIONS vpon *Heresy*, or Innouation in Religion.

For your greater encouragement hereto, obserue this following? That Prince would hold it for a great Aduantage, to wage such a war, wherein he were assured, that many of his Enemyes souldiers would fight in his behalfe.

And

And yet your Case is heere the same; hence in this your spirituall Combat, or Bookwar with *Hereſy*, you haue the voluntary and vncoasted confeſſions of your Adverſaries, euen fighting on your ſide; As you may euidently diſcerne by the many acknowledgments of the Proteſtants, deuoured in ſeuerall former *Animaduuerſions* againſt themſelves, and in ſtrenghtning of our Roman Religion. Thus you draw a Sword from the Enemies ſyde, and after ſheath it in his owne bowells.

The moſt illuſtrious and worthy *Cardinal Bellarmine* (that chiefe *Hereſy-Maſtix* of this age) in his Preface to the Bookes of his (1) Controuerſies, vndertaketh to (1) Preſhew the Neceſſity of ſtudy of Controuerſies in this our age: I preſume his words will be moſt preuayling with you all, and therefore I haue thought fit to ſet them downe de verbo in this place, by translating them into Engliſh for the better ſatiſfaction euen of the more vulgar Reader: Thus then he writeth: *Utilitas quidem propositarum nobis Diſputatio- num ex eo intelligi facile poteſt &c.* The profit of the Diſputations vndertaken by vs, may eaſely from hence be apprehended. *Agendum eſt enim, non de ſtillicidijs, & fundis, non de rebus lenibus &c.* For heere we are to diſcourſe, not of the droppings of the eames of a Houſe, not of farmer, or Country Houſes, not of ſmall and light matters (little amaying, whether they be after one manner or other:) Neither are we to diſpute of *Meta-*

Metaphysicall subtilties; of which without any detrimēt to the soule, a man may be ignorant, & the which may sometymes be impugned, with Commendation and prayse of the Opponent: But here we are to dispute of God, of Christ, of the Church, of the Sacraments, of justification, of the ayde of Grace, of the freedome of Mans Will, and of many other most graue, most difficult, and most abstruse points, which belong euen to the foundation and essence of sayth; Of all which generall Articles, if a man laboreth by disputation

(1) *Au-* to weaken but any One, then (as S. Austin (2)
sim lib. prudently admonisheth) that man seeketh to
 1. *contra* overthrow the whole frame of that, which we be-
 Iulian, lieue in Christ. Furthermore, to recall Hereticall
 cap. 2. men to the light of sayth, or at least to repress &
 breake their force and fury, to dryne awa, those
 fierce Beasts, from our Lords sheepfold; to pro-
 tect and defend the Church of Christ; to rescue or
 snatch away the sheepe (already taken) from the
 iawes of those Wolves, and to bring them back
 to our Lords custody; How great (here I demand)
 is this Benefit, how true a cause of inward Com-
 fort, and how copious is here the harvest of eter-
 nall glory? But not any of these things can be ac-
 complished, but only by those men, who haue been
 long, and much conuersant in these Questions,
 which men, by such their labours and diligence,
 haue both fortified their Cause with the munition
 or furniture of the Church, as also haue learned
 to repell, and annoyde the weapons of their
 Enemyes, and to turne the edge of them vpon the
 Enemyes themselves. Thus far the learned and
 zealous Cardinall. But

But to proceede further. It is ingrafted in Mans Nature to vse the more diligence and vigilancy, in oppugning and resisting his Enemyes, by how much the Enemy is more dangerous and cruell, where he overcommeth. From hence then, may appeare the most exitiable, and calamitous effects, which the Enemy heere by me meant (to wit *Heresy*) produceth, where she hath any Domination, & rule ouer the soules of men. Now this point I will in like manner deliver in the words of the foresaid *Cardinall*, who declaring the most dangerous Nature of *Heresy*, (thereby to perswade his Auditors and Readers, being capable thereof, to the study of Controuersies of Religion, for the better and more easy resisting or extinguishing of *Heresy*) thus writeth: *Duo* (3) (4) *Exim*
sunt, quæ pestem præ cæteris morbis, meritò hor- lar. vbi
rendam terribilem; efficiunt: Unum &c. There supra.
 are two things, which cause the plague to become more fearefull and terrible, then any other Disease, or sickness. One is, that the plague doth diffuse and send forth its venome with great hast and speed, euen vnto the Hart; and so in a moment of tyme destroyeth a man, being but a litle afore most sound. The other effect of the Plague is, that in killing of one, it killeth many hundreds; and this is performed, in that the plague so quickly creeps and spreades it selfe abroad in diuers places; so as if this day it hath infected but one house, within a short tyme after, it doth innade the whole City, replenishing it with dead Bodies. I dipsum
 omnia

omnino est in animis Heresis, quod in corporibus pestis &c. Now looke, what the plague in the Body, the same is Heresy in the Mynd, or soule: *Primum Gratia munus &c.* The first gniſt of Grace, which we receaue from our Heavenly Father in our Conuerſion, and Juſtification; The first pulse or Motion of a reuining or renewed Hart; briefly the first ſenſe, or feeling of a ſpiritual Lyſe, is doubtleſſy Fayth. Now from Fayth the Mynd is aſter by little and little ſtirred up in Hope; the Will to loue; the tongue burſteth forth into open Confeſſion of true Chriſtian ſayth; and the hands are ready to the performance of work worthy a Chriſtian. Now then ſeeing Heresy preſently aymeth at the Hart of the ſoule, and proceedeth ſo far in depriming her of her gifts and priuiledges of Grace, as that it laboreth to ſoſtall or extinguiſh the very beginning it ſelfe of all diuine and Celeftiall Lyſe; } then here demand, what peſtilence can be thought more damageable or pernicious, then Heresy?

(4) 2.
Tim. 2:

To come to the ſecond point: I would to God, that the Heretike did hurt but only himſelfe, and that he had not diſperſed his poyſon, far and a broad. But we finde it moſt truly written by the (4) Apoſtle; } weane, that the words and ſpeeches of Heretike, as a Canker, do creepe far, and wyde. Witneſſe of the truth hercof is this our age; For who is ignorant, that the Lutheran peſt, or plague (first being begun in Saxony) within a ſhort tyme did poſſeſſe almoſt all Germany? and then it made its paſſage to the North, and to the Eaſt. For it hath already innaded Denmark, Norway, Swe-

A Paraneetical Conclusion.

385

*tia, Gothia, Pannonia, Hungaria. Against, with the like celerity it turning it selfe towards the West and the South, hath in a short tyme depopulated or destroyed a great part of France, all England and Scotland (heretofore most flourishing kingdomes for Religion) yea it hath scaled the Alpes, and penetrated as far as to Italy. Thus far, with great sense and feeling doth the learned Cardinall discourse of the Nature of Heresy. But to proceed to diuine Authority; from hence then we now may more clearely see, that the Apostle speaking of Heretikes, had iust reason to say: *Hereticum* (5) *(5) Tit. hominem &c. A man, that is an Heretike, after the first and second admonition, auoyde;* knowing that he, that is such an one, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned by his owne iudgment. And againe the same Apostle: *(6) men made shipwracke touching sayth;* (6) *1. Ti. And S. Austin (touching Heresy) resting himselfe vpon the Authority of the Apostle, thus pronounceth: Nihil (7) sic formidare debet &c. A Christian ought to feare nothing so much, as to be separated from the body of Christ, which is his Church; and which is One, and Catholicke; for if he be separated from the body of Christ, he is not a member of Christ; If no member of Christ; then he is not strengthened with his Spirit; But who hath not the spirit of God, the same Man is not of God. Thus S. Austin.* (7) *Austin tra. 17. in loan**

Now then (Reuerend Brethren) against these men, which are mayntayners of Here-

B b

ff,

fy, I too much desire you to employ your tyme and studie. O thinke how comfortable a Cogitation it will be to any of you, lying vpon your death bedis: and how able it will be through Gods mercifull acceptance therof, to expiate many a sinne when any of you may truly say: *So many soules, which afore were infected with Error in sayth and beliefe, and therein stood obnoxious for the tyme to eternall perdition. were by me reduced to the true Catholike and saving sayth, through the meanes (vnder God) of that small talent is Controuersyes, which his Diuine Majesty vouchsafed to bestow vpon me: so as you may say of them in the words of the Apostle, In Christo* (8) *Jesu per euangelium vos genui.*

(8) L.
Cor. 4.

Yt many yeares since, that war was stiled & accounted most worthy and sacred, which was vndertaken by Catholike Princes and their Subiects, for the recovery of the Holy Land, wherein Christ suffered death, & wherein were then remayning and extant many memorialls of his Lyfe and Passion; And if those Princes and Souldiers were deservedly endued for such their truly Heroicall and spirituall Resolution and aduenture, with many immunities and priuiledges by the then Church of God; Yf that War being vndertaken for temporall matters (I say) was in those dayes reputed so honorable, as to deserue such great respect and estimation: what shall we then conceaue of this War of yours, whereby you seeke to rescue the sou-

les of your Brethren infected with Heresy, from out the iawes of the Deuill, & to im-plant in them that sayth, in which they on-ly can be sau'd? Therefore hold such slouth-ful Clergy men among you (if so other- wise God hath giuen them sufficient capaci-ty and apprehension) but as *Paraliticke mem-bers* in the Church, who by study and la- bour will not endeauour to be able to per- forme the operations, and facultyes belon- ging to their profession.

And as touching such of you, as shall ar- riuē to that perfection, as to wryte Bookes in defence of your owne Religion; what consolation may it be to your Soules, and increase of accidentall glory, when your Bodies being corrupted and turned into ashes, you neuerlesse shall dayly speake (by meanes or your wrytings) to posterity, in- structing them in the way of Saluation? The liuing acknowledge themselues much be- holden to those (though long since de- parted this world) who haue recorded in wryting the temporall and humane Lawes of their owne Country, and haue cleared them with the true meaning of the first Lawgiuers; what obligation then is due by the liuing to such dead men, who haue faithfully by their pens deliuered and ex- plained the Law (not of man) but of God; I meane the Gospel, and vndoubted sayth of Christ; by the fruition of which Law and sayth, the soule arriueth to its eternall felicity.

city, as through the want of it, precipitately falleth into euerlasting damnation? And can any kynd of study, more then this, be prized?

But some of you, who are of lesse spirituall courage, may perhaps say: The Lawes of the Realme prohibit vnder great penalty all perswading to a Religion, contrary to the present state and profession of the Realme: It is so indeed; But withall the same Lawes do prohibit your entring into the Realme, after your taking of the Holy Orders of Priesthood; will you be so ready then to expose your Bodyes to death for the one, and yet will forbear for feare of death the other?

Againe, that *Statute* was made by a *man Prince*, and the *Laity*, the incompetent Iudges in matters meereley spirituall; But there is an other *Statute* (so to terme it) enacted by a Potentate infinitely supreme, I meane by *God* himself, who thus commandeth vs by his Apostle: *Obedire (9) oportet Deo magis, quam hominibus*; a *Statute* indeed, which ought far to preponderate all humane *Statutes*, or decrees. And admit you should endure death for such your spirituall Labours (of which there is small feare, or rather small hope, in regard of his Majesty's most element and mercifull disposition) were it not a happines for you, to redeem your Sinnes by so glorious a death? Furthermore, how can that be accounted death, which

(9) *Ad.*
3.

(3) Ro.
11.

Earth, and eternall in Heauen; and do you often call to mynd those words of S. Paule: *We (12) are to be subiect to higher powers, seeing there is no power but of God.* But to returne back. Take to your Consideration, the great vie you shall haue of your skill and knowledg in English Controuersies. For first, there are many morall Protestants (both Gentlemen of worth, & others) who scorne all base cariage towards you, with whom by the interueniency of friends you may haue (as daily experience sheweth) opportunity to discourse touching matters of Religion; Many of which (as before little bearing and lesse belieuing, what the Catholike can speake in defence of their Religion, & against theirs) will afford a greedy and listening Eare to your speech. How large a fyard then haue you here, wherein to plant and disseminate your owne sayth?

Diuers *Ministers* do spit their Venome out of their pulpits, in their weekly Sermons, and Inuectiues against the Church of Rome; as also many Bookes, written by Protestants, do yearly come out, imposing their Readers with their impostures and fraud against the Catholike Religion. And is it not then a thing worthy of all labour, to be able to detect, and lay open the said calumnies with your pens? Furthermore, Admit any of you should be apprehended and sent to prison, what good (if your knowledg in Controuersies be sufficient)

ficient

ficient) may you do in that place, to those
 of a different Religion, who either out of
 curiosity will repayre to you, to see what
 can be said by you in defence of your Re-
 ligion; or out of a Puritanicall & vaunting
 Malice of Ministers, shall seeke by dispute
 (hoping you are little experienced in those
 studyes) to disgrace and dishonour your
 Religion? In prooffe of which point, I can
 affirme out of my owne knowledge, that a
 certaine (*) Priest (a Vertuous man, and
 much practized in Controuersies) once ta-
 ken and sent to the Common prison, was in
 the beginning much assaulted by diuers
 Ministers openly in the presence of the Iud-
 ges of the Assises, as also after in the Priest's
 priuate Chamber; but he so bare himselfe in
 his answeres and disputes with them, & did
 so gaulle them (like a strong beare casting
 of at his pleasure, the weake and cowardly
 dogs, which seeke to take hold of him) as
 that the Iudges rested much abashed there-
 at, commanding, that no further open Dis-
 putation should after be had with him. He
 also was assaulted by some Puritans in pri-
 son; but he gaue them such entertaynment,
 as that they grew quickly weary of him; so
 as staying a good while after in durance, he
 could not haue a sight of any of them. This
 Accident gaue in that Shyre, where it hap-
 pened, great credit to the Catholike Cause,
 and wrought much spirituall Good.

(*) M.
 W. B.

Now, thinke you not, that this Priest's la-

bour was most happily and fruitfully spent
 in the study of Controuersyes? And why
 may not then any of you vpon returne into
 your owne Country, and imprisonment,
 haue the like oportunity presented vnto
 you? At what tyme if your talent in dispute
 be great and preuailing, you get ground v-
 pon *Here*; if but sinall and elementary, you
 become a disgrace to your Priesthood, and
 to your Religion, and are made a foyle to
 your Aduersary. Therefore (*worthy men*)
 make great disquisition and search by your
 owne priuate Labours into those Contro-
 uersyes, which are at this day most agitated
 betweene the Catholikes and the Prote-
 stants, and through desire of vanquishing
 your Aduersaries, become euen breathles
 therein. And though you shall haue vse of
 other Studyes, as *Cases of Conscience*, and of
school Diuinity (which serue chiefly to ap-
 ply *Vniuersall Truths* of *Schools*, to particu-
 lar points of *Controuersyes*) yet let the Study
 of *Controuersyes* be your favorite Study; &
 make it become (at it were) *Ars Architedu-
 nica* to all the rest. You are to become spiri-
 tuall Pastours to mens soules, feeding them
 with the celestiall foode of the Sacraments
 of Gods Church; yet euer remember, that
 that Shephard performeth his duty with the
 greatest perfection, who not only preser-
 ueth and keepeth safe those sheepe, which
 are already enclosed in his folds; but la-
 boureth also to reduce, and bring back to
 the

the fold, such straying sheepe, as yet lye open to the danger of the Wolves. Thus much out of my thirsty desire of perswading you (what in me lyeth) to the earnest prosecution and imbracing of the foresaid Study.

But now, before I end this my *Parenesis*, and exhortation to you, I will make bould (with your good lykings) briefly to set downe, what Course, or Method I could wish you to take in the Studyes of Controversies, euer subiecting my iudgment herein, to the iudgments of the more learned and better experienced Controversists.

1. First then I could wish you (because our Aduersaries seeme to rely chiefly vpon Scripture) to be much conuersant in such Texts of Scripture, as are either objected by them, for the impugning of our doctrine, or which are insisted vpon by vs; for the confirmation of the same; But touching such passages of Scripture, which we vrge, it were good to make choyce of those, whose true interpretation is indifferently acknowledged, by vs and our Aduersaries; for these are most pressing. Such are the Texts touching the continuall vifibility of the Church of God; and of its priuiledg of conuertyng Heathen Kings, and Kingdomes vnto it, as is aboue shewed in some of the former *Animadversions*.

2. Be most expert in the Protestant English Translation of Scripture (as is aboue

premonished) for this gauleth the Aduersaries the more, in that they cannot take exception against the Translation; and certainly the Scripture, euen as translated by them, most euidently foyleth their Cause.

3. Concerning those passages of Scripture, which are chiefly vrged by our Aduersaries, it were necessary to obserue the true interpretation of them, either in *Bellarmines* his Controuersies, or in the *Rhemist* *Glossament*; if so they be drawne out of the *New Testament*.

4. Touching the authorities of *Fathers* and *Councils*, considering it requireth a mighty labour to read them at large, & that either your want of hauing them, or want of opportunity, and tyme in perusing of them, may easely preuent the same, Therefore I could wish you first to peruse them in the *Tomes* of *Bellarmino*, and then to content your selues with the *Confessions* of the learned *Protestants*; who openly disclayme from them, as *Patrons* of *Papistry*; which *Confessions* of our Aduersaries throughout all points of sayth, you may easely fynd in the foresaid booke of the *Protestants Apology*.

5. I could wish you in prooffe of any *Catholike* point, to be much conuersant in *Arguments* drawne from *Reason*; because those arguments stealingly penetrate the iudgments of the vnlearned, and also they are more easely committed to memory. A-

gain,

gaine, arguments drawne from Reason may be vsed at all tymes and vpon any okeasion without the help of Bookes, which are not euer at hand. And furthermore the force of Reason is such, as that it is not in Mans power (after his true apprehension thereof) to withstand in iudgment, or struggle against it, since man himselfe is a reasonable Creature. The Controuersies of Bellarmine will afford you all abundance of this kind of prooffe.

6. It is very necessary (as is deliuered in one of the *Animadversions*) that you be most prepared, and well furnished in the Controuersies, which consist vpon *Matter of fact*; Such are the foresaid mentioned points of *Conuersion of Kingdomes*, of the *supposed continuall Visibillity of the Protestant Church*, of *Ordination, Vocation, and Mission of Ministers* in the Church of God: All which must receaue their prooffe from Histories. And hence it is, that our Aduersaries foreseeing, they cannot warrant from History these points to be performed in their Church; therefore in their extremest need herein, many of them are forced for their last refuge to say, *That the true Church is endued with all these priuiledges, But their Church is the true Church, as they proue (say they) from Scripture; Therefore in their Church all the former points haue bene at all tymes performed: A most shamefull begging of that, as granted, which stil is in Question, and a subtile trans-*
sition

fiction from *History* to the *Scripture*, and this, as it is expounded only by themselves. Others againe of them for the better vindicating of their *Church* from the imminent danger ensuing from the premisses, are glad to throwd their Church, vnder our Catholicke Church, teaching that both of them are but one and the same Church (a Paradox implicitly refuted in some of the former *Animadversions*:) but *Durum telum necessest*; vnto such poore shifts doth penury & want bring Men.

You ought to be obseruant, what collaterall points touching the Articles of sayth, we Catholickes should to be but *Matters of Indifferency*, and may without breach of sayth (as not being defined by the Church) be holden either way. These you are to distinguish, from those other Conclusions of sayth, which are inuiolably maintayned & belieued by all Catholickes. And therefore if your Aduersarie should insist in this kind of *Indifferency* (to proue therby a disunion in iudgment among Catholickes) you may tell him, he doth but diuerberate the ayre, and impertinently and ignorantly vrgeth such points which in no sort impugne the *Vuity* of our Catholicke Church. Now to know what points be meere *Indifferencies*, I refer you to the most painifull, & learned booke called, *The Triple Cord*: where you shall find certaine *Paragraphes*, reserued only for the expressing of them, in each mayne *Cōtroversy*.

To conclude (referring the diligent Reader to diuers of the former *Animaduersions*, tending to the Method of studying of *Controuersies*; I could desire you to be most expert in impugning the Question of the *Private Spirit*, and skilfull in the *Iudge of Controuersies*, since these two mayne points potentially include all other *Controuersies* within them, as a greater Circle comprehendeth in it selfe a lesser Circle. And thus (*Vermont Men*) wishing you a most plentiful haruest in this your Spirituall tillage of soules (so to terme it) I cease; Once more most humbly beseeching you, euen by that force of Christian charity, which I presume your selues do enioy; and by that true hope of Mercy, which at the last day you expect as our *Sanctors* hands, that you would beare to me (both liuing and dead) a charitable & pitifull Remembrance, at the tyme of your chiefest deuotions; I meane, at the tyme of celebrating that most *Dreadfull Sacrifice*, wherein our *Sanctour* (by the ministry of your selues) daily offereth vp his owne sacred body and bloud to his Heauenly Father, for the expiating of sinne in Man. And with this, I giue you all my last farewell, & shall euer remayne,

*Yours in all Christian, and
religious Obseruancy.*

N. N. P.



*A Table of the chiefe Controuersies
handed in this Booke.*

A.

A *Disphorists* in Religion, who? *Animad.*
60.

Adoration of Saints, and Angells. *Anim.* 34.

Adoration of the holy Eucharist. *Anim.* 166.

Albigenses, & *Waldenses*, what they were.

Animad. 103. 104.

Angells, how they may be painted: *Ani-*

mad. 32.

Antichrist, his first coming assigned by

Protestants. *Animad.* 35.

The Pope cannot be *Antichrist*. *Animad.* 153.

The *Antinomi*, Heretickes, descend from

Luther. *Animad.* 148.

Articles of Cath. Religion maintayned by

Protestants. *Animad.* 187.

Articles negatiue ought to be proued by

Scripture by Protestants. *Animad.* 55.

Atheisme in many Protestants of England.

Animad. 193.

S. Augustine highly extolled by Protestants.

Animad. 162.

The *Authors* vow and Prayer for the King

& Queene. *Animad.* 191.

Cath:

The Table.

Cath. Authors ordinarily reiected by Protestants. *Animad.* 3. 4. & 42.

B.

B *Eades*, their vse and antiquity. *Anim.* 83.
Blessed *Virgin Mary* her Virginity. *An.* 47
Her freeing from Originall sinne. *Anim.* 183.
Her Assumption into Heauen. *Animad.* 183.
A Body may be in two places at once: *Animad.* 91.

C.

C *Aluin*, an Enemy to the Diuinity of Christ, & the B. Trinity. *Anim.* 138.
Caluins exposition of, *Hoc est Corpus meum.* *Animad.* 49.
Carlostadius impugned the Masse by persuation of the Diuell. *Animad.* 59.
Catholike Religion neuer changed. *Animad.* 79. 80.
Title of *Catholikes*, and antiquity thereof. *Animad.* 175.
Catholiks, or Protestants, whether incline more to vertue. *Animad.* 65.
Catholiks and Protestants cannot be both saved. *Animad.* 176.
Ceremonies derided by Protestants and Puritans. *Animad.* 63.
About the Ceremonies of the Masse. *Anim.* 16.
The Churches definition of Protestants. *Animad.* 192.
Church of Protestants inuisible. *Animad.* 192.
Christian Religion planted in England, when. *Animad.* 36. *Common*

The Table?

Communion vnder one kind. *Animad.* 28.
75.

Comparison betweene the liues of Catholiks
and Protestants. *Animad.* 188.

Conference of places of Scripture. *Anim.* 54.

Councells Generall depressed by Hereticks.
Animad. 50.

The Creed, whether it contayneth all Arti-
cles necessary of Religion. *Animad.* 61.

D.

ABout the *Decalogus*, or Ten Comman-
dements. *Animad.* 30

Decrees of Popes, fraudulently vrged by
Protestants. *Animad.* 38. 39.

Deity of Christ denyed. Also the Immorta-
lity of the soule. *Animad.* 194.

Difference betweene Scriptures and Fathers.
Animad. 40.

Difference betweene Protestants themselues
about Scripture. *Animad.* 48.

Difference betweene Preachers of Cathol
and Protestant Doctrine. *Animad.* 160.

Disputation with Protestants, how to order.
Animad. 20. & 41.

Disputing with Protestants by entercourse
of letters. *Animad.* 73.

Doctors, and Pastors alwayes to be in the
Church. *Animad.* 117.

E.

Elias his Example much vrged by Prote-
stants. *Animad.* 151.

About

The Table.

About the Holy Eucharist. *Animad.* 26. 125.
126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 165. 166.

The Eye of a Man wonderfull. *Animad.* 196.

F.

F Abricks of the world. *Animad.* 199.

The Face of a Man admirable. *Anim.* 197.

Ancient Fathers their Authorities reiected
ordinarily by Protestants. *Animad.* 3. 4.

yet loath to break with them. *Anim.* 42. 43.

Their aduantages for interpreting of Scri-
pture. *Animad.* 41.

Their maintayning of Papistry. *Anim.* 66.

The doctrine of Freewill. *Animad.* 133. 134.
135. 136.

G.

G enerall Conncells depressed by Hereticks.
Animad. 50.

God the Father, how he may be painted.
Animad. 31. 32. 33.

God, the Author of sinne affirmed by Pro-
testants. *Animad.* 183.

Grace, what concures in working thereof.
Animad. 164.

Grecians euer emulous of the Church of
Rome. *Animad.* 119.

H.

T He Hand of a Man wonderfull. *Anim.* 198.

All Heresies arising haue byn recorded by
the Church of Rome. *Animad.* 118.

Hereticks first deniall of diuers points of
Cath.

The Table.

Cath Religion. *Animad.* 11.

Hereticks called after the Name of their first Author. *Animad.* 77. 78.

Hereticks condemne Prophets, Apostles, Fathers &c. *Animad.* 140.

Their charge of Catholiks with the errors of the Heathens. *Animad.* 141.

Holy-water, and its Antiquity. *Animad.* 84.

About the Hymne of *Ave Maris Stella*. *Animad.* 46.

I.

THe *Jewes* delivered many Articles of Catholike Religion before Christs coming. *Animad.* 98.

Jewish Ceremonies many still retayned. *Animad.* 158.

Images, how they may be painted. *Anim.* 31. discussed by Philosophy. *Animad.* 33.

Immortality of the Soule denyed, and defended. *Animad.* 194.

About the doctrine of *Judulgences*. *Animad.* 171. 172.

Induration of Pharaos hart. *Animad.* 150.

Invention of a false opinion, may be perhaps of no Hereticke. *Animad.* 15.

Inuisibility of the Protestants Church. *Animad.* 104. 139. 180.

Iustification and Merit of Workes. *Anim.* 29.

Iustification by only Fayth. *Animad.* 189.

K.

Of *Kings* and *Queenes* excommunicated;
and deposed. *Animad.* 191.

Knowledge of a *Deity*, what? *Animad.* 194.

Knowledge of the *Soule*, what? *Animad.* 194.

L.

Libertines descended from *Luther*. *Animad.* 148.

Euill Lines of *Popes* objected by *Protestants*. *Animad.* 145. 146.

Luthers Exposition of *Hoc est Corpus meum*.
Animad. 49.

Luthers Spirit being a *Catholike*, and being
an *Hereticke*. *Animad.* 57.

Luthers Change of the *Mass* by persuasion
of the *Diuell*. *Animad.* 53. 59.

Luther no perfect, and entyre *Protestant*.
Animad. 101.

Luthers doctrine why applauded. *Anim.* 144.

M.

B. V. *Mary* her *Conception* immaculate.
Animad. 44.

The little respect *Protestants* giue vnto
vnto her. *Animad.* 45.

Lesse giuen to her by *Puritans*. *Anim.* 47.

About her *Hymne* of *Aue Maris Stella*;
Animad. 46.

Markes of the *Protestants Church*. *Anim.* 13.

Marriage of *Priests* vrged by *Protestants*.
Animad. 154.

The Table.

Masse, and the Antiquity therof. *Anim.* 159.

Merit of Workes. *Animad.* 29.

Miracles depressed by Protestants. *Animad.* 70.

N.

Necessity of the visibility of the Roman Church. *Animad.* 137.

Neutralls in Religion, what they should? *Animad.* 60.

Notes of the Church. *Animad.* 108. 142.

P.

Persecution of Catholikes vnder Q. Elizabeth. *Animad.* 9.

Practice in Controuersies much commended. *Animad.* 86.

Prayer to Saints. *Animad.* 81.

Prayer in a strange tongue. *Animad.* 109.

Prayer needlesse, and fruitlesse with Protestants. *Animad.* 186.

Protestants, their sleight in answering Cath. Bookes. *Animad.* 131.

Protestants, whether there were any before Luther. *Animad.* 109. 110.

Protestants sooner become Atheists, then do Catholikes. *Animad.* 109.

What required to a perfect Protestant. *Animad.* 102.

Protestants would seeme to agree with the Ancient Fathers. *Animad.* 67.

Protestants voyde of all reall Fayth. *Anim.* 182.

Prote.

The Table.

Protestants and *Jewes* iump in many things.

Animad. 5.

Protestants agree which *ancient* condemned
Hereticks. *Animad.* 6.

Their false alleaging of *Scriptures*. *Animad.*
52.

Protestants opposite one to another, in their
writings. *Animad.* 17. 18. 19.

Protestants charged with a violent Circle in
their disputes. *Animad.* 21.

Their flying to the *Primate Spirit*. *Animad.*
22. & 100.

Their little respect to the *B. V. Mary*. *Ani-*
mad. 45. 46.

Protestants maintayne diuers *Articles* of the
Cath. Fayth. *Animad.* 187.

Protestants charge *Cath. Religion* with tea-
ching disobedience to *Princes*. *Anim.* 191.

Protestants Rebellion in *France*, *Holland*,
Germany &c. *Animad.* 191.

Protestants definition of their Church. *Ani-*
mad. 192.

Protestants, many of them *Atheistes*. *Ani-*
mad. 193.

Protestants Inuectiues one against another.
Animad. 63.

Protestants charged with *Ancient Heresies*
by *Catholiks*. *Animad.* 64.

Protestants pretend their *Writings* and *Me-*
mory to haue byn extinguished by the

Popes. *Animad.* 68.

Protestants borrow from the Church of
Rome. *Animad.* 94.

The Table.

All Protestants, or their Forefathers some-
tyme Catholikes. *Animad.* 88.

They cannot agree about their owne do-
ctrines. *Animad.* 97.

Protestancy, when it was in its full height.
Animad. 177.

Puritans their dishonour of the B.V. Mary.
Animad. 47.

Purgatory defended. *Animad.* 149.

R.

The *Reall-Preſence* diſcuſſed. *Animad.* 89.
125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 155. 156. 163.

Reall-Preſence maintayned by Protestants
againſt Puritans. *Animad.* 7.

Their Arguments alſo againſt the *Reall-Preſence*.
Animad. 8.

Doctrin of *Reſuſcency* taught both by Ca-
tholiks and Protestants. *Animad.* 178.

About the Doctrin of *Reprobation*. *Anim.*
184. 190.

Roman Religion neuer changed. *Animad.* 10.

Roman Religion only capable of Salvation.
Animad. 121.

S.

Saints to be prayed vnto, lawfull. *Animad.* 27.

Saluation certayne in the Cath. Roman Re-
ligion; *Animad.* 71.

Scripture how to be interpreted. *Animad.* 37.
152.

Difficult to be vnderſtood. *Animad.* 167.

Wh

The Table

Why written by the Apostles. *Anim.* 170.
About the Signe of the Crosse. *Animad.* 82.
Soule of Man immortall. *Animad.* 194.
The similitude it beareth to God. *Anim.* 200
Spirits, be an inuisible substance. *Anim.* 198.

T.

T Raditions vnwritten impugned by Protestants. *Animad.* 181.

Traditions knowne by certayne Rules. *Animad.* 168.

Translations of the Scriptures by Protestants corrupted. *Animad.* 173. 174.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation. *Anim.* 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130.

Truth, how it may be deliuered in negatiue words. *Anim.* 96.

V.

T He Vbiquity of God. *Animad.* 93.

The Virginity of our B. Lady. *Anim.* 47.
Her freedome from Originall sinne. *Anim.* 183.

Visibility of the Roman Church proued by the Inuisibility of the Protestant Church. *Animad.* 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 180.

Visibility of the Protestants Church maintained by them. *Animad.* 12.

Vniuersality a strong Argument for Cath: Religion. *Animad.* 157.

The Voyce of a Man admirable. *Anim.* 197.

The Table.

- W** *Went ye for it or yd?*
W *Aldeus & Albigenes, what they were*
Animad. 103. 104.
The taking of a second Wife often an abuse
in Protestants. Animad. 179.
Word of God written. Animad. 1. 2. 3.
Words of Christ in the last Supper how to be
taken. Animad. 23. 24.
The Worldes existence from Eternity im-
pugned. Animad. 195.
The fabricke of the World. Animad. 199.

Z.

- Z** *Zinglius his impugning the Masse by per-*
suation of the Diuell. Animad. 59.

FINIS.